# DISCOURSES

## Touching the Antiquity

## OF THE

# *HEBREW*

## TONGUE and CHARACTER.

I. An Examination of certain Arguments that have been lately urged in Proof of the Primævity of the *Hebrew* Tongue. With remarks on Mr *Holloway*'s manner of ſpiritualizing *Hebrew* proper Names, in his *Letter and Spirit*, &c.

II. Some Account of the Correſpondence between Dr *Chandler*, late *Biſhop of Durham*, and Mr *Holloway*, upon the Primævity and Pre-eminence of the *Hebrew*: With a Reply to Mr *Holloway*'s late Treatiſe on that Subject, ſo far as it concerns his Lordſhip.

III. An Enquiry into the force of Mr *Holloway*'s Arguments to prove that the ancient *Hebrew* Letters were not the ſame as thoſe which are now called the *Samaritan*. With a Remark on what he ſays of the *Samaritan* Shekels.

By THOMAS SHARP, D.D.
Archdeacon of NORTHUMBERLAND,
And Prebendary of DURHAM.

LONDON,
Printed for J. KNAPTON in Ludgate-Street.
MDCCLV.

# THE PREFACE.

THE firſt of theſe Diſcourſes was drawn up in the year 1753, (ſoon after Mr *Holloway* had publiſhed his *Letter and Spirit*, &c.) and was originally intended to have been part of my *Review and Defence of the Diſſertations on* Elohim *and* Berith, in reply to a repeated aſſertion of my opponents, that *The Biblical Hebrew was the language of* Adam *in Paradiſe*. But as *the Review*, &c. had already ſwelled to a bulk beyond my expectation, and as this point was not ſo cloſely connected with the arguments I had then in hand, but that it might be poſt-poned, or even wholly ſuppreſſed without prejudice to them,

I thought the dropping it at that time was excuſable, and that what I had prepared might on ſome future occaſion go abroad by itſelf, as *a Supplement to the Review*, &c. if I ſhould find reaſons hereafter to induce me to publiſh it.

NOR was it long before an occaſion was offered, by the publication of Mr *Holloway*'s treatiſe, intitled *The Primævity and Pre-eminence of the Sacred Hebrew*; in which he has taken much pains, by a variety of arguments, to prove the truth and certainty of the ſame point, that my opponents had before preſſed me with, viz. *That the Biblical Hebrew was the Primæval Language.* And whereas he tells us in his *Preface*, that this piece "*Had lain ſeveral years by him, and ſo, "perhaps, would have continued to do, had "not* Dr Shuckford's Supplemental Diſ-"courſe on the Creation and Fall of Man, "*given him a freſh occaſion to make it "public*;" ſo I beg leave to make uſe of the ſame kind of apology, if any be needful, for printing *now*, and not *before*, the firſt of the following Diſcourſes, which might in like manner have lain dormant

dormant by me ſome years, or perhaps had never been brought to light, had not Mr *Holloway*'s performance on the ſame ſubject invited it forth, and given me ſome reaſon to hope, that it might prove no leſs uſeful and acceptable to the Public, than it would appear ſeaſonable.

THE ſecond Diſcourſe which accompanies it, and to which, from the affinity there is between the ſubjects, it ſerves for a proper introduction, is in juſtification of Dr *Edward Chandler*, late Biſhop of *Durham*; or, in defence of the part his Lordſhip bore in a private correſpondence, ſome years ſince, with Mr *Holloway:* Who in his aforeſaid treatiſe on the Primævity, &c. hath thought fit frequently to refer to his Lordſhip's letters, expreſſions, and ſentiments on that queſtion, but does no where ſo fully cite and explain them, as his Lordſhip's friends, and all who knew his great ſagacity as well as erudition, could wiſh had been done. For in the imperfect and mutilated ſtate in which they lie in Mr *Holloway*'s account of them, they ſeem rather to be placed as foils to ſet off his own arguments,

guments, than allowed to appear either with any advantage to themſelves, or with any credit to his Lordſhip. By which means both the correſpondence, and the iſſue of it are put into ſuch a light, as the learned author would not probably have choſen to repreſent them in, had his Lordſhip been yet alive to ſpeak for himſelf, and to tell the whole of the caſe on both ſides.

THE particular inducements I was under to ſet this correſpondence, and chiefly his Lordſhip's ſhare in it, in ſome more proper and ſatisfactory light, will be ſeen in the Diſcourſe itſelf; where the reader will find, from certain circumſtances there mentioned, that this undertaking in vindication of his Lordſhip, did ſo peculiarly belong to me, that I could not, all things conſidered, have juſtly or decently declined it.

THE third and laſt Diſcourſe concerning the ancient Hebrew character, is in reply to two Addreſſes, if I may ſo call them, made by Mr *Holloway* to myſelf, on that perplexed ſubject. It is a point

a point in which I had no ways concerned myſelf at any time, and which had no immediate relation to either of the ſubjects of my Diſſertations. But Mr *Holloway* was pleaſed to introduce it himſelf into his controverſy with me, firſt, in his *Remarks on Dr* Sharp's *pieces*, p. 25. under pretence of it's being *a matter of conſequence, which was much wanted by the learned world*; and *next* in a note, at the end of his *Primævity*, &c. where he ſuppoſes he hath diſcovered at length the very thing that *occaſioned the whole miſtake that hath gone abroad* concerning this matter; and "*Which* (ſays he, *p.* 95.) "*I purpoſed to have* "*given in another edition of my piece a-*"*gainſt Dr* Sharp."

Now, though I do not conceive myſelf under any obligation to examine what he has advanced on this ſubject, either in his ſaid *Remarks*, or in his ſaid *Note*; yet as his arguments ſeem more particularly propounded to my conſideration, and are recommended as being of extraordinary importance in this intricate queſtion, I have made a pretty ſtrict enquiry into their force and effect, in this Diſcourſe; which

which I have here annexed to the two other treatiſes abovementioned: And I preſume not improperly, ſince the queſtion concerning the antiquity of the Hebrew Alphabet is ordinarily found ſubſequent to, or appendant on, that other concerning the Primævity of the language.

A N

# AN EXAMINATION OF

## Certain Arguments that have been lately urged in proof of the Primævity of the Hebrew Tongue.

A PECULIAR ſtreſs is laid by Mr *Bate*, Mr *Holloway*, Mr *Moody*, and *the Author of the Chriſtian Plan*, *&c.* *. upon the Primævity of the Hebrew Language; that is, for ſo ſome of them explain it, on the biblical Hebrew being the language of Adam in Paradiſe; and from thence forward the language of the World, to the time of the Diſperſion

* Mr *Bate*'s Scripture meaning of Aleim, p. 88.
Mr *Moody*'s Evidence for Chriſtianity, &c. p. 91.
Mr *Holloway*'s Remarks on Dr *Sharp*'s pieces, p. 14.
Preface to the Chriſtian Plan, 4to. p. 7.

at *Babel*, and from the Diſperſion, either the language of mankind to the time of *Moſes* the firſt writer, or at leaſt (for to *that* Mr *Holloway* confines his Aſſertion) the language of the Patriarchal line, down to the Age in which the Scriptures were written.

DISCOURSE

# DISCOURSE I.

## SECT. I.

*Examination of Mr* Moody's *Argument for the Primævity of the Hebrew, drawn from Mr* Hutchinſon's New Account of the Confuſion of Tongues.

MR *Moody* ſtates the caſe very briefly, and reduces the Enquiry into this ſubject to a ſhort Iſſue.

HE "begs the reader's attention to two "points only."

1ſt. THAT "the Language ſpoken be- "fore the Affair at Babel, was the language "of *Adam*, ſo of Paradiſe." And,

2dly. THAT "Mr *Hutchinſon* has "proved that no confuſion of Languages "happened at *Babel*, but the ſame Lan- "guage which was ſpoke before, conti- "nued to be ſpoken by all men down to,

" and at the time of *Moſes* writing the Pen-
" tateuch, and long after.

" THEREFORE (ſays he) the Biblical
" Hebrew is the language of Paradiſe." p. 92.

HE appeals likewiſe to the reader, " Whether the Doctor, in fair Contro-
" verſy, ſhould not have confuted Mr
" *Hutchinſon*'s Account before he offered
" his Arabic in Evidence." *ibid.*

ONE would imagine from this appeal, that I had been contending for the Primævity of the Arabic, or had *offered it in evidence* againſt the Primævity of the Hebrew; whereas, Mr *Moody* may recollect, that I was upon another Argument when I referred to the Arabic; of which language, I only ſuppoſed, with ſome of the greateſt men in the Oriental Learning, that it might contain certain Roots of Hebrew Original, which Roots are not now found in the Hebrew Scriptures.

BESIDES, if Mr *Hutchinſon* himſelf did not confute, but did only in general terms except againſt the commonly received opinion of *the Affair of Babel*, before he offered his own Solution of it under the title of *A New Account of the Confuſion*

*of*

*of Tongues*; under what obligation did I lie to confute his Account, before I might be permitted to ſpeak any thing that did not ſeem to agree with it?

If it be ſaid, that He confuted the common expoſition, if not before, yet when he offered his own Solution, and that therefore I ought to diſprove his Account before I can juſtly proceed further in the preſent Subject,——In order to give Mr *Moody* the ſatisfaction he claims, I ſhall remit him to One who may give it him compleatly, and from whom he may take it better than from me; viz. Mr *Holloway*, Who in his late Treatiſe intituled, *Letter and Spirit*, &c. Vol. I. p. 120. diſproves, and overturns all that Mr *Hutchinſon* had built on his too haſty Remark on the noun שפה. For according to the New Account, (ſee p. 17.) that word is "*never* once uſed, when uſed for "voice, in any other ſenſe than for Con-"feſſion."——And this Mr *Holloway* has ſhewn to be a miſtake: and Mr *Moody* muſt now, by his *own rule of fair controverſy*, confute Mr *Holloway* before he can again aſſert what he has unwarily affirmed at p. 91. viz. that "Mr *Hutchinſon*

" has proved from Scripture, that the af-
" fair at Babel was not *a Confuſion of*
" *Tongues*, but *of Confeſſions*."

Mr *Holloway* likewiſe contends, (*Letter and Spirit*, Vol. I. p. 120.) for the Diviſion of the one language of the Earth into a variety of Dialects, and for the Diſperſion of the Nations by means of the ſaid Diviſion of Tongues; contrary to Mr *Hutchinſon*'s poſition, abetted by Mr *Moody*, p. 92. viz. —— " That the He-
" brew was the common language for
" many ages after, until men, by imita-
" ting writing by letters, revealed to *Mo-*
" *ſes* in the Mount, formed by degrees,
" by falſe ſpellings, and ſuch like mi-
" ſtakes, different languages."

Mr *Moody*, indeed, tells us a few lines below, that " Mr *Hutchinſon*'s Account
" muſt be allowed as fact, till the con-
" trary is proved to ſatisfaction."—This demand is too large, yet Mr *Holloway* hath ſatisfied it: And it now remains that Mr *Holloway*'s Account, which is indeed, in reſpect of this particular, concerning a Confuſion of Language, the Old Account, and " *according to the Tradition that hath*
" *gone out into all the Earth*," (ſee Letter and

and Spirit, p. 119.) muſt be allowed as fact, till Mr *Hutchinſon*'s New Account can be made out to ſatisfaction; which I never expect to ſee, for other reaſons beſides the capital miſtake about שפה, on which his hypotheſis is built.

And what Mr *Holloway* hath ſaid upon this article, is ſtill the more to be attended to, becauſe he herein oppoſes, as he tells us himſelf, *a perſon to whoſe Writings he paid no ſmall regard*, (ibid. p. 115.) And ſets himſelf againſt *an Argument, in which he had for ſome years acquieſced*, (p. 119.) But which nevertheleſs, *on further ſearch, and upon weighing the matter more carefully, he found to be without foundation.* (p. 115, and 119.)

This is ingenuouſly ſaid; and his following the Truth, though it obliged him to deſert a Writer he ſo much eſteemed, merits due Praiſe. An earneſt, I preſume, of more ſuch commendable examples from others, who, though prejudices may prevail over them at preſent, yet on further ſearch, and more careful weighing the matter, may come to think differently from what they do in this, as well as in other points of the New Hypo-

theſis. Mr *Hutchinſon*, indeed, intended (as he ſaid towards the beginning of his *New Account*, &c. p. 9.) " *to ſettle the* " *chief points in Religion, ſo that it ſhould* " *not be in the power of man to diſturb* " *them.*" Yet he could not, we ſee, ſecure to himſelf the fulfilling of his expectations, even from thoſe on whom he had the moſt reaſon to depend, that they would never diſappoint him.

BUT to return to the ſubject in hand. As what Mr *Holloway* has ſaid, hath ſet aſide Mr *Hutchinſon*'s *New Account*, &c. in this particular, regarding *Shaphah*; ſo what Mr *Hutchinſon* hath ſaid in his *New Account*, concerning the Hebrew not being ſolely preſerved by, or confined to the line of *Shem*, from the time of the affair at *Babel*, to the time of *Moſes*; but of it's being the language of the idolatrous nations *, deſcended from *Canaan*, doth equally ſet aſide Mr *Holloway*'s ſuppoſition, that the confuſion of Tongues was only among

* " It appears by the names of places, and perſons, " and many other ways, wherever *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, or " *Jacob* came, Hebrew had been there firſt, and was their " then preſent language." *New Account*, p. 29.

among the poſterity of *Ham* *, and that the Hebrew tongue, as well as the true Religion, was loſt to the heathen world, though it was preſerved in the ſacred Line †.

THAT the Progeny of *Ham*, within the borders of *Canaan*, talked Hebrew long before *Abraham* removed into that country, is proved by the ſame kind of proof that is commonly made uſe of to ſhew that Hebrew was the language of the World before the Flood, and down to the time of the Confuſion.

THE

* " *Ham*, and his curſed progeny *Cuſh*, *Miſraim*, *Ca-*
" *naan*, &c. had infected their minds with the old *Cainitic*
" imagination, and there was no reclaiming them from it
" but by God's dividing their language into a multiple
" gibberiſh, of as many dialects as there were families."
*Letter and Spirit*, p. 115.

" The Earth, *Gen.* xi. 1. is taken for the Apoſtate
" World, when they began again to fall off under their
" Arch-Tutor *Ham*, which (beſides one original Tongue
" or Speech) had all one ſtile, or manner of talk, accord-
" ing to the Religion or Philoſophy of *Cain* then revived.
" Yet would not God for this deſtroy the World again,
" but would confound their language, and with that their
" talk, or Religion, and Philoſophy." *ibid.* p. 109.

† " St *Cyril Alex.* reflects very properly, that the true
" Religion and the Hebrew Tongue were thus loſt toge-
" ther to the Children of Men; that is, to the Heathen
" World, till the Gift of Languages, given on Mount
" *Sion*, healed the Confuſion gone out from *Babel*."
*ibid.* p. 119.

THE names of men and places (as Mr *Hutchinſon* obſerved), the names of all the nations, or ſeparate communities, living in the land of *Canaan* are Hebrew. And not only the names of cities and of the Kings and Governors thereof, but the names of their mountains, plains, rivers, trees, fields, &c. are Hebrew alſo. And there are more Teſtimonies of proper Names of Hebrew Original, in the Scripture Hiſtory of the ſojournment of *Abraham* in that country, than are to be found in the Hiſtory of the foregoing Ages, from the beginning of the World. And there ſeems no way to be taken to ſet theſe Teſtimonies aſide, but what will prove equally effectual for ſetting aſide the Teſtimonies of the ſame kind, which are urged in proof of Hebrew being the language from the beginning of the World.

MR *Hutchinſon* appears to have clearly ſeen the conſequences of this Truth, if the common Account of the Confuſion of language at *Babel* is allowed to ſtand: For, on that ſuppoſition, the *Canaanites* either had their Hebrew as one of the Dialects into which the One Language of the

the Earth was broken, which will not conſiſt with the Primævity of the Hebrew that is contended for; or, that they had the peculiar privilege of retaining and preſerving the Original among them after the Confuſion, and when it was loſt to all the other nations, even to thoſe who deſcended from *Shem*, except, it may be, to One family in his Line. To which extraordinary privilege the *Canaanites* ſeemed of all other people to have been the leaſt intitled, as they were a people, of all others, curſed, and deſtined to deſtruction.

Mr *Hutchinſon*, indeed, avoids theſe conſequences by aſſerting, that the One language of the World was univerſally retained to the Age of *Moſes*. And he has taken particular pains (*New Account*, from p. 27, to p. 32.) to ſhew that Hebrew was the language of *Egypt*, *Meſopotamia*, *Æthiopia*, &c. as well as of *Canaan*. In which, how he hath ſucceeded, I ſhall leave to the judgment of his readers; obſerving only thus much, that the proofs of it's being the language of any country, ſave *Canaan*, fall very ſhort of the proofs of it's being the language

of

of *Canaan*. He hath alſo taken no leſs pains to ſhew in ſeveral pages following ——By what ways or means a variety of languages might have been occaſioned in the World, after writing was revealed to *Moſes*, and was practiſed by him and the *Iſraelites*. And, perhaps, I do not conjecture much amiſs, in ſuppoſing that Mr *Hutchinſon*'s principal inducement to look out for ſome other ſolution of the Tranſaction at *Babel* was, that he might ſtand clear of the difficulties that ariſe to an Aſſertor of the Primævity, and ſacred Prerogatives of the Hebrew, from admitting the Diviſion of Tongues along with the diſperſion of the Families, and at the ſame time allowing (what yet cannot well be denied) that the *Canaanites*, after the Diſperſion, were in poſſeſſion of the Hebrew Tongue, and were the *only nation* that could boaſt the Original Language as their own.

Mr *Holloway*, indeed, has ſhewn that Mr *Hutchinſon*'s Solution (by which theſe difficulties are avoided), ſo far as it concerns שפה in the ſenſe of *Confeſſion* inſtead of *Speech*, and ſo far as it excludes the Confuſion and diviſion of the One original

nal language at *Babel*, is by no means ſatisfactory. But hath he not left himſelf under a like difficulty (with reſpect to the Hebrew Originals), with that which Mr *Hutchinſon* avoided by his New Solution? viz. How to account for Hebrew being the language of *Canaan*, from the very earlieſt intelligencies we have of that Country? and ſhould he not *in fair controverſy* (as Mr *Moody* ſays) have removed this obſtacle, before he concluded that Hebrew was appropriated to the line of the Faithful, and was loſt to all thoſe who had loſt the true Religion?

And yet the Reader who finds he hath done any thing in this whole Treatiſe, intituled, *Letter and Spirit*, &c. to clear up this Objection, has had better luck in his ſearch than I have had in mine. It is true, He hath given us a Spiritual Interpretation of ſeveral of the Old proper Names of Hebrew Original, impoſed by the *Canaanites:* And he hath found a way of referring them, in ſome manner or other, to the Chriſtian Diſpenſation. But under this light, I apprehend, they have little claim to be conſidered, as they were given to perſons, and places, by Idolaters, and

and Enemies of the true Religion and Faith.

IT may be ſaid, perhaps (for ſo, I think, ſome have thought and ſuggeſted), that the names by which places in *Canaan* were called at the time of *Abraham*'s peregrination thither, are not given by *Moſes* as they were then called by the *Canaanites* themſelves, but as they were afterwards named by, and known to the Poſterity of *Abraham*; and that the names of places mentioned in the Book of *Joſhua* are likewiſe Hebrew, not as being impoſed by the old *Canaanites*, but as being given to thoſe places by the people of God, after they had conquered the Land, and before the Hiſtorical Book of *Joſhua* was wrote.

BUT theſe ſuggeſtions, I think, will have little weight, when we conſider that both *Moſes* and *Joſhua* do generally, tho' perphaps not always, make mention of the Old Names of thoſe places, of which they give the New Names impoſed by *the Iſraelites:* Which old *Canaanitiſh* Names are as pure Hebrew as the new *Iſraelitiſh* ones, as will be ſhewn preſently in ſome remarkable inſtances. And what is more,

This

This way of accounting for proper names, will by no means hold in the names of perſons, recorded along with their tranſactions: Becauſe, although places yet in being when theſe Hiſtories were wrote might have new names given them, by which they were known when the Hiſtories were written; yet it is a moſt unlikely thing that new names ſhould have been given to men and women after they were dead, and that thoſe new names ſhould be recorded inſtead of the names they bore when living; and this without any notice given of their true names having been changed.

It may be alſo, and has been, ſuggeſted, that *Moſes* in writing the Pentateuch altered the names impoſed by the *Canaanites*, either by giving new names properly Hebrew, but of the ſame interpretation with the true names firſt impoſed; or by new moulding the old names, ſome way, into a conformity with the Hebrew idioms. Of this opinion was *Nic. Fuller* *. But *Bochart* cannot admit of

* " Utut nomina illa univerſa purè Hebræa ſint, ta-
" men ullum ex illis Chananæorum eſſe, vel à Chana-
" næis

of it as being altogether without proof *. He obſerves, that when the *Reubenites* gave new names to the cities they rebuilt within their lot, *Moſes* takes ſpecial notice of it. (ſee *Numb.* xxxii.) Whence he infers no change was made in the reſt, where no change of name is mentioned. He obſerves alſo, that when *Moſes* had occaſion to ſpeak of places with which the *Iſraelites* did not concern themſelves, he gives them Hebrew names; that is to ſay, their old proper names, ſince no reaſon can be given why either He or the *Iſraelites* ſhould change them. Of this we have an example in צור צרפתה צידון.

And it may be added further, that to give the conſtruction of a proper name inſtead of the name itſelf, is not doing the part of an Hiſtorian. A very few inſtances of this kind may be found in the tranſlations of Hiſtories (where nevertheleſs ſome reaſon for them will be found alſo), as Συγχυσις in the LXX, inſtead of *Babel*,

" næis impoſitum pernegamus. Quin potius vetuſta ab
" indigenis Chananæis impoſita nomina ab Hebræis in
" eaſdem ſedes ſuccedentibus Hebraico more poſtmodum
" prolata & expoſita, &c. fuiſſe aſſerimus."

* *Bocharti Canaan*, Lib. ii. cap. 1. p. 776.

*Babel*, Gen. xi. 9. But it is not the manner of the Sacred Writers to give *Conſtructions* of the foreign names, inſtead of the *names themſelves*. The name by which *Pharaoh* called *Joſeph*, Gen. xli. 45. —viz.—*Zaphnath-Paaneah*, is, I take it, *Egyptian*, put in Hebrew characters by *Moſes*, as alſo *Aſenath* the daughter of *Poti-pherah*, Prieſt of *On*; which three proper names, mentioned in the ſame verſe, ſeem not to be of Hebrew original. Thus, likewiſe, in the books of *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *Eſther*, *Daniel*, the *Chaldee* proper names are all retained.

IT is true there are Hebrew etymologies given to *ſome* of them, in the *Index* of proper names annexed to the Polyglott Bible, ex. gr. to *Nebuchadnezar*, *Artaxerxes* *, &c. But, I believe, whoever conſiders theſe conjectures, will ſcarce allow they carry any probability in them.

*BOCHART*, indeed, preſerves a ſmall diſtinction between the language of the *Canaanites* and that of the *Iſraelites*, by calling the one *Phenician*, and the o-

* Heb. ארתחששתא, נבוכדנאצר & ארתחשסתא & נבוכדראצר.

ther *Hebrew*. But it is ſo inconſiderable, as not to affect the queſtion now in hand. He looked upon the *Phenician* as a Dialect of the Hebrew, but not as a different language *. Nay, he ſuppoſes it the ſame language, providentially preſerved among thoſe who inhabited old *Chanaan*, for the greater convenience, and better accommodation of the Patriarchs, when God ſhould call them to ſojourn in that land †.

But whoſoever will look over the *Canaanitiſh* proper names, recorded by *Moſes* in *Geneſis*, and enquire into their ſignification, as given in the *Index*'s at the end of *King of Spain*'s Bible, and the *London Polyglott*, or that other *Index* of the ſame kind, but a little diverſified (chiefly, I preſume, for the ſake of introducing ſome of

* "Non dubito quin Moſes & Joſua illa ipſa locorum "nomina exhibeant quæ apud Chananæos erant in uſu, "ſolâ flexione mutatâ ut ſit in diversâ Dialecto." *Canaan*. L. ii. c. 1.

"Notum eſt in Græco ſermone aliam eſſe Atticam di-"alectum, aliam Æolicam, &c. Sic Phoeniciam dia-"lectum ab Hebræâ diſcrepaſſe facile conceſſero, modo "nequis aſſerat plane aliam fuiſſe linguam." &c. *ibid.*

† "Deo ita volente non in Chananæorum, ſed in A-"brahami gratiam, & aliorum ex ejus ſtirpe, ut tolerabi-"lior eſſet peregrinatio Patriarcharum in terrâ Chanaan." *ibid.*

of Mr *Hutchinſon*'s peculiar conſtructions), at the end of Mr *Romaine*'s edition of *Marius de Calaſio's Hebrew Concordance*, will receive, I think, ſufficient ſatisfaction from the names of perſons and places, not only within the borders of *Canaan*, but in ſome of the next adjacent countries, that the old *Canaanites* uſed no other language than the Hebrew. I ſay, ſufficient ſatisfaction; for though it ſhould not be peremptorily ſaid, that the names are *all* of Hebrew original, merely becauſe words in that language may be aſſigned, which ſingle or compounded are, or are made like them, yet many of them are too evidently Hebrew to admit of a diſpute, and are themſelves, when all that may be accounted lucky *paronomaſia's* are excluded, ſuperior to any evidence of that kind that is brought to prove Hebrew the language of the *Ante-babel* world. Enow ſurely there are to ſuffice for my preſent argument, and alſo to ſhew the improbability of Mr *Holloway*'s account, that the true primæval language was preſerved *only* in the line of *Heber*.

For theſe Hebrew names either prove, as I before obſerved, that there was no

confuſion of tongues at *Babel*, but that the poſterity of *Ham* ſpake the one language of the world, down to the times of *Moſes* (which is Mr *Hutchinſon*'s hypotheſis); or, that the poſterity of *Ham* ſuffered nothing by the confuſion, but retained the Noachical language, while the reſt of the nations ſpake different languages. To neither of which can Mr *Holloway* accede. Yet he hath not told us, hitherto, of any *medium*, or third way of accounting how the *Canaanites* came by the Hebrew language, if it was neither the old *Ante-babel* language preſerved in *Ham*'s line, nor one of the many dialects into which the language of the earth was divided at the Confuſion.

MAY not a third perſon, who attends to the evidence given on one hand by Mr *Holloway*, of the certainty and conſequences of the confuſion at *Babel*, in the one language of the earth among the progeny of *Ham*; and alſo to what is ſaid, and truly ſaid by Mr *Hutchinſon*, on the other hand, that Hebrew was in *Canaan* before *Abraham* came thither, and was the language of that vile race, deſcended from *Ham*, which was deſtined to deſtruction; I ſay,

I ſay, may not a third perſon find ſome reaſon to call in doubt that concluſion which both theſe Gentlemen would draw from oppoſite premiſes? may he not make it a queſtion, Whether the Primævity of the Hebrew be proved by either of their arguments? or, is there any harm in thinking, or ſaying, what will conſiſt with the truths, or facts, they have reſpectively proved, viz. that Hebrew was the language carried by the deſcendants of *Canaan*, the Son of *Ham*, after the diſperſion at *Babel* into the land called after their progenitor's name, from their ſettlement therein; and that it was not brought thither by *Abraham* out of *Meſopotamia*, but was preſerved there for many years in greater purity than any other dialect, till the Patriarch to whom the country was intended in God's ſecret counſels to be given, was called thither to take poſſeſſion of it?

When Mr *Bate* ſays, (Scripture meaning of Aleim, p. 88.) that *he cannot find that one language was ever wrecked at Babel.* If he means that there was never any confuſion of language there, taking this notion altogether, as may be preſum-

ed, from what Mr *Hutchinſon* has been pleaſed to aſſert concerning the *ſole* meaning of *Shaphah*, *when uſed for voice*; I remit him to Mr *Holloway*'s account of the uſage of that word in the place before referred to, and of *God's dividing the language of* Ham's *progeny into a multiple gibberiſh, of as many dialects as there were families.*

When he ſays, (*ibid.*) that *we have the ſame reaſon to believe the Hebrew to have been the language of* Adam, *as we have that it was the language of* Abraham; his argument, if it be a good one, will go further than he is willing it ſhould; for of thoſe kind of proofs by which it is to be ſupported, we have fuller and ſtronger of it's being the language of the old *Canaanites*, than of it's being the language of *Adam*, or even of *Abraham* himſelf, till he travelled into *Canaan*.

When he ſays, *We have not one hint to the contrary, that it was not the language of* Adam. (ibid.) This would prove nothing if it were true. But what muſt we think of the Scripture Account of God's confounding the one language of the earth at *Babel?* May not this be looked upon,

upon, as *a hint*, at leaſt, to the contrary of what he aſſerts?

And laſtly, When he ſays that *Moſes writes the hiſtory both of* Adam *and* Abraham *in that language in which both of them ſpoke:* This is more than he knows with reſpect to *Adam*, and is no proof of it's primævity, if allowed as to *Abraham:* Becauſe it appears by the ſame kind of evidence, that it was ſpoken by the *Canaanites* before *Abraham*'s time. And Mr *Holloway* will tell him, that he can carry *their* language no higher than the confuſion of tongues at *Babel.*

There is, indeed, a more obvious, and a more ſatisfactory anſwer to be given to his aſſertion, *That* Moſes *wrote in the language that* Adam *ſpoke*, which I ſhall offer when I come to examine Mr *Moody*'s poſition to the ſame effect, in the third ſection.

But, in the mean time, it may be proper to enquire into Mr *Holloway*'s new manner of ſpiritualizing the names of men and places in *Canaan*, and to ſee what effect it ought to have upon this ſubject; leaſt it ſhould be concluded too haſtily from thence, that theſe ſpiritual ſenſes are

themſelves evidence, that thoſe names were impoſed by holy men in the choſen line of the Patriarchs; and that there muſt be ſome miſtake in ſuppoſing that, becauſe the *Canaanitiſh* proper names are Hebrew, therefore Hebrew was the native language of the *Canaanites*. For thoſe names being of myſtic and ſpiritual interpretation, muſt neceſſarily have been firſt given by ſome of the Faithful, with whom neither the true religion, nor the original language were ever loſt, till the times of the Babyloniſh captivity.

SECT.

## SECT. II.

*Examination of Mr* Holloway's *ſpiritual or rectified ſenſes, of the proper names in* Chanaan, *in the time of* Abraham.

THE moſt proper entrance into this enquiry will be, with the entrance of *Abraham* into *Canaan*; and the whole compaſs of it may be confined to the xiith and following chapters of *Geneſis*, to the xxiiid inclusive: wherein are contained the proper names of the cities which the Patriarch found when he firſt travelled thither, and the proper names of perſons with whom he converſed there, and of other places which are occaſionally mentioned in this part of his hiſtory, viz. from his leaving *Haran*, to the death of *Sarah:* This period being, of all others, the moſt unexceptionable, for examining the merits of the queſtion under conſideration.

*Letter*

*Letter and Spirit*, p. 129.

GEN. " chap. xii. ver. 6. *And Abra-*
" *ham paſſed through the land unto the place*
" *of Sichem.*] *Sichem* ſignifies—the *ſhoul-*
" *der, riſing early, preſenting early*, or *rea-*
" *dily bearing*. So this place, by it's name,
" was a *figure* of the *Patriarch's forward-*
" *neſs to obey*, and to *ſuffer* alſo, what to
" the *Divine Wiſdom* ſhould ſeem fit, in
" this *peregrination of Faith* to which he
" was called.

" *UNTO the plain of Moreh.*] Or,
" unto *the oak*, or *the plantation of oaks*
" *of viſion*. So we from the *enduring of*
" *Faith*, are come to the *firmneſs*, and
" everlaſting *eſtabliſhment* of the *Divine*
" *Preſence and Viſion.*"

THESE are Mr *Holloway*'s two firſt obſervations upon the proper names within the period above limited. To which I ſhall ſubjoin his laſt, within the ſame period, as a further ſpecimen of his manner of ſpiritualizing the *Canaanitiſh* names of places in *Abraham*'s time, viz. upon Gen. xxiii. 19. *And after this Abraham buried Sarah his wife, in the cave of the field of Machpelah, before Mamre; the ſame is Hebron in the land of Canaan.*

" HE

"HE would not bury her (ſays Mr *Holloway*, p. 222.) "in the unholy ground "of the *Hittites*, [*dead men*] but in *Mach-* "*pelah*, *(the reverſion of our diſſolution by* "*death)* before *Mamre*, (that which is "for *viſion of our change)* the ſame is *He-* "*bron*, *(joined unto the Lord)* in the land "of *Canaan*, the place of our *pilgrimage* "among the *negotiators* of this world."

AND immediately after this, he tells us, by way of concluſion to his comment on this remarkable period.

"THESE are the *ſpiritual ſignifications* "of the ſeveral *proper names* of the *places* "abovementioned; and putting them thus "together, gives an hieroglyphic deſcrip- "tion of the end, means, object, and "whole courſe of our progreſs in *Faith*, "through *this world*, to the *Reſurrection* "*and Kingdom*. How great and wonder- "ful is the myſtery of Godlineſs, that "both the acts and affairs of the Saints "of God from the beginning, with the "names or words given to denote, or "deſcribe them, ſhould under a literal hi- "ſtory, exhibit a ſpiritual, or covert and "adumbrative Goſpel!" p. 222, 223.

I MAKE no doubt of our author's well meant zeal in this matter, yet I am ſorry it ſhould carry him, in the end of this paragraph, ſo far as to repreſent thoſe who *think this method of ſpiritual interpretation arbitrary, or fanciful*, as being very *weak*, if not worſe, even *faulty* in thinking ſo. Yet, as he *does not take upon him to ſay, whether they are more to be blamed or pitied*; it is poſſible he himſelf may be miſtaken, in ſuppoſing they fall either under his cenſure or his pity: At leaſt, till he hath previouſly anſwered a few queſtions, that ought to be put to him, upon his conſtruction of the *Canaanitiſh* names, as

1. WHETHER he can make any reaſonable pretence, that thoſe proper names were not impoſed by the inhabitants of the land, before *Abraham* came to ſojourn among them?

2. WHETHER they who impoſed the ſaid names could have any view therein, either to the future peregrinations of the Patriarch in that country, or to the *means, object, and end of our progreſs in Faith?* If not,

3. WHE-

3. WHETHER they may be ſuppoſed, by a divine or prophetic impulſe, to have given ſuch names to perſons and places, as ſhould correſpond with *Abraham*'s diſpoſitions and behaviour in his peregrination and ſojournment in that country; and thereby at the ſame time adumbrate the *acts* and affairs of the ſaints of God in after-ages?

AND if this be not admitted,

4. WHETHER *Abraham* himſelf deſignedly ſhaped his courſe, or was led by the direction of Providence in his peregrination to thoſe places, whoſe names beſt ſuited his extraordinary vocation and character, and were moſt deſcriptive of the bleſſings deſigned for his poſterity?

OR, if this ſeems improbable,

5. WHETHER, laſtly, *Moſes* contrived *ſo* to adjuſt the proper names of perſons and places in *Canaan* with *Abraham*'s removals, actions, and circumſtances there, and *ſo* to lay them together in order of narration, as to *exhibit*, *under a literal hiſtory*, *a covert Goſpel*, and *form an hieroglyphic deſcription* of what ſhould befal the promiſed Seed, *in their progreſs in Faith through*

*through this world, to the Reſurrection and Kingdom?*

And as Mr *Holloway* hath ſaid nothing, as far as I can find, that can lead us to any ſatisfaction in theſe queſtions; and as ſome ſatisfaction ſhould be given before he will ſeem to have any authority to extend his ſpiritual interpretations to the old *Canaanitiſh* proper names; one may, without imputation either of weakneſs or fault, ſuſpect that the myſtic ſignifications of them, which he hath already offered by way of ſpecimen, are merely his own private interpretations, and are not to be received by us, as the *ſpirit* of thoſe words in Scripture; eſpecially as there are few or none of them but what are capable, with equal propriety, of other literal conſtructions than he has given them, and conſequently ſuſceptable, with equal probability, of other ſpiritual ſenſes, (if there be any ſuch myſtery at all in them) than what he conceives to be ſuggeſted by them.

And I ſhall now beg his leave, to enter ſo far into the proof of this, as to ſhew that moſt of thoſe proper names within this period of *Abraham*'s hiſtory, out

out of which he has extracted ſuch recondite ſenſes, as enable him to form therewith an adumbrative Goſpel; will bear a more eaſy and probable conſtruction, under a literal conſideration, without regard to a future religious diſpenſation, than they do in the myſtick prophetick light in which he has (for reaſons of his own) conſidered them.

שכם *Sichem* ſignifies what Mr *Holloway* ſays, *a ſhoulder*, *riſing early*, &c. But it alſo ſignifies what he has not mentioned, viz. *a part*, or *portion:* as in *Gen.* xlviii. 22. " I have given thee *one portion* " (שכם אחד) above thy Brethren, which " I took out of the hand of the *Amorite*, " with my ſword and with my bow." And as the name of a town, it is more reaſonable to interpret it, either of the *lot* or *portion*, of the firſt head of a family that ſettled there, or, as being called by the name of the man who firſt founded it, (for it was alſo *a man's name*, Gen. xxxiii.) than to conclude that this town by reaſon of it's name, was a *figure of Abraham's forwardneſs to obey*, and *to ſuffer*, &c.

אלון מורה. *Plain*, or plantation of oaks, of *Moreh*. Mr *Holloway* obſerves the *Jeruſalem Targum* renders it by *Valley of viſion*.——But then the LXX render it by Την δρυν την υψηλην. *Vulg*. Convallem illuſtrem. Here we ſee the verſions differ in both the branches of his ſpiritual interpretation; none of them putting *Oak and Viſion* together, as he doth, for the ſake of a remote application. And *Cartwright* (Annot. in loc.) ſays of thoſe who aſſign the word *Moreh* this ſenſe, a ראה haud ſatis commodè deduxiſſe videntur. For the form of the word will not admit of ſuch a derivation.

But if אלון מורה bore any ſignification from מראה *viſion*, it would have been interpreted more agreeably to Mr *Hutchinſon*'s principles, of a memorial of the trees in Paradiſe, which were *deſirable for viſion, as emblems conſtituted to ſhew the Originals. (Uſe of Reaſ.* Vol. I. p. 110. and *Introd. to Moſ. ſine princ.* p. 122.) Of which the oak in particular, was *the ſymbolical tree of the Elohim, and is yet a memorial of the loſs of innocence. (Chriſtian Plan*, p. 21.)

But,

BUT, indeed, there are other verbs which have a better pretence to be the roots of מורה than ראה. ex. gr. ירה jecit, מרה Rebellis fuit, מרר amarum eſſe, vel מור mutare. And yet probably it may come from none of them, but may perhaps be a noun of the ſame ſignification with the *German*, *Saxon*, and *Engliſh moor*, Terra inculta, ſterilis, ericetum, as a learned acquaintance of mine conjectured, (ſee *Skinner*, and *Junius*'s *Etymologicon*) who added, that *Moriah*, commonly interpreted *the place of Viſion*, might as well be conſtrued the *High-moor*, in conformity with the conſtruction of Har-Elohim.

חתי *Hithæi*. *Hittites*. The etymological ſenſe is Confracti, formidantes, aut ſtupentes. (Index nom. prop. *Polyglot*.) Ex חתת, ſtratus eſt humi, ſi dicatur de corpore; ſi vero de mente dejectio animi ſive conſternatio. *Romaine*. And ſo Mr *Holloway*, p. 220. upon בני חת, *Gen.* xxiii. 3. "The children of *Heth*, that "is, as the name ſignifies, the children of "Conſternation." But, when he adds, —*or caſting down by death*; and when he interprets *Hittites* here, *Gen.* xxiii. 18, 20.

by *dead men*, he ſpiritualizes beyond the etymology of the word, and charges the letter with a ſenſe which it doth not appear at any time to carry in the language.

THE ſame, I think, may be ſaid of מכפלה *Machpelah*, of which he gives the *ſpirit*, by *the reverſion of our diſſolution by death*. To which, I can find no nearer an approach in the derivation of the word, than that מפלה ſignifies *Cadaver*. This word is not explained either in the *Polyglot* or Mr *Romaine*'s index. Probably becauſe it was not thought a proper name. All the old verſions make it an appellative, tranſlating it *double*, as, indeed, the obvious root of it is כפל *duplicavit*. But, as to any ſpiritual ſenſe that can be raiſed out of it, I am quite at a loſs.

ממרא *Mamre* —— * *that which is for viſion of our change*, ſays Mr *Holloway*. Why not, *that which is for change of our viſion*, to which the word, if it be a compound of מור and ראה anſwers full as well, as to the other ſignification.—That it may have ſome connexion with מור which

* ממרא contumax, vel exaltans ab המריה exaltavit ſe. Hilleri Onomaſticon, p. 876.

which in Hiphil (המיר) ſignifies *mutare*, ſeems to be acknowledged both in the Polyglot and in Mr *Romaine*'s index, where it is conſtrued after other ſenſes given, *commutans*, vel *permutans*. But Mr *Holloway* has joined the idea of *viſion* to that of *change*, for the following reaſon given by himſelf at p. 136.

*MAMRE*, ſays he, had it's name from an *Amorite* " ſo called, or rather " both the grove and the man were de- " nominated from the heathen imagina- " tion of the tranſmutation of forms, by " diſſolution and death. Though *Abra- " ham* held the name in it's rectified ſenſe, " for the change he hoped for by the Re- " ſurrection from the dead, and for the " *viſion* of Divine things, which as a pro- " phet he was made to SEE, which idea " is alſo comprized in the word."

NOW, indeed, viſion is here accounted for two ways. But how the idea of viſion ſhould *be comprized* in a word denoting in it's firſt uſe, *tranſmutation of forms*, (if that really was it's meaning) ſeems very ſtrange. For if the name was not originally impoſed by a Prophet, who foreſaw Divine things as *Abraham* did,

but was given to an *Amorite* from an heathen imagination; it cannot be ſuppoſed to include or comprize the idea of a future reſurrection. And, therefore, I may preſume, that it is our author only who holds it in this rectified ſenſe: and that neither *Abraham* nor *Moſes* held it in any other view than as the proper name of a man, and of a place called from him; and that too, without any regard to the etymological meaning of it, as expounded by Mr *Holloway*.

חברון. *Hebron*——*joined to the Lord*; ſo Mr *Holloway* on the word, *Gen.* xxiii. 19.—p. 222. But in chap. xiii. 18.—p. 137. —— "*Hebron*, that is *conjunction*; "the great conjunction which the faithful expected, was that of the divinity "with the humanity of Chriſt." Yet we find other ſenſes in which it may be taken, as *incantatio*, and *livor*, from the ſame root חבר (ſee the indexes in Polyglot, and Mr *Romaine*). *Hiller* interprets it by *ſodalitium*, and *ſocietas*, p. 784.

But, as Mr *Holloway* ſuppoſes this name to have been given, not by the *Canaanites*, but by "*Abraham* firſt, on his "reſiding there to teſtify his faith in the "great

" great conjunction in the perſon of " Chriſt; and again, by *Joſhua* and *Caleb*, " upon *Caleb*'s taking it from the *Amorites* " many years after." I will not reckon it among the *Canaanitiſh* names we are enquiring into, but ſhall paſs on to the old heathen name of this city *Kiriath-Arbah*. ——But not without a remark by the way, that our author, not recollecting that he had in p. 137. aſcribed the nomination of *Hebron* firſt to *Abraham*; tells us upon *Gen.* xxiii. 2. (*Letter and Spirit*, p. 219.) that " *Hebron* was afterwards ſo " named by *Caleb*, in faith of the con- " junct perſon of Chriſt, to whom he " had wholly adhered, when the other " ſpies, and the whole people of *Iſrael* " that came up with *Moſes* and *Aaron*, fell " off in the wilderneſs."

And that he may account how *Moſes* ſhould ſpeak of this name before it was impoſed, or ſhould mention it in his hiſtory of *Abraham*, ſo long before *Caleb*'s driving the children of *Anak* from the place; he tells us, ibid. that *Moſes ſpake of it prophetically, as if it were already ſo called.*

BUT then, how will he account for what *Moſes* ſays of the ſpies, *Numb.* xiii. 22. that *they came to Hebron*, before *Caleb* (who was one of them) had either impoſed the name, or had ſhewed *that adherence* to Chriſt, of which he made this name the memorial? Or, how will he account for what *Moſes* adds in the ſame verſe, viz. *Now Hebron was built ſeven years before Zoan in Egypt.* Was this alſo prophetically ſpoken?

BUT to come to the old *Canaaniti∫h* name of this city קרית ארבע.

*KIRIATH Arba.* That is, ſays Mr *Holloway*, the *city of four.* p. 219. He rightly rejects the Jews tradition of this city, being called *Arba four*, from the *four* pairs of perſons buried there, which, as he obſerves, could not be, "becauſe this city was ſo called by the "heathen people, to whom it belonged "before *Abraham* came into thoſe parts." p. 137. So here is, by his own confeſſion, pure Hebrew in uſe among the old *Canaanites.* Some have thought they might mean the city of the *four winds*, becauſe it ſtood on a high hill. (Vid. *Reland.*) But, our author obſerves, that *four*

*four* was the number " which afterwards " made the famous *tetractys* of *Pythago-* " *ras*;" and therefore he collects, that the *Canaanites* " probably meant by it, " *Fire*, *Light*, *Air*, and *Æther*, in abu- " ſive imitation of the Trinity, and the " Man Chriſt Jeſus, repreſented by the " *four cherubic* heads." p. 137, and 219.

BUT this does not well agree either with Mr *Hutchinſon*'s philoſophy, or with his account of the *Cherubim*. For his material *Aleim*, or conditions of the heavens are but *three*, and in *that number* emblematical of the Trinity. And the perſons in his *Cherubim* are but three, and repreſented by three heads only, though one of thoſe heads hath two viſages. " So " there were three heads, and four viſa- " ges." *Catcott*'s Sermon, p. 13.

BUT is it neceſſary we ſhould underſtand *Arba* here in the ſenſe of *four*? ארבע may ſignify *accubatio*. (ſee Ind. prop. nom. Polyglot.) And this ſenſe of it from ר ע agrees with the Pſalmiſt's רבעי *accubitum meum*, *my lying down*, as our tranſlation hath it, *Pſal.* cxxxix. 3. And *civitas accubitûs* ſeems altogether as admiſſible as מקום שכם *locus matutina-*

*tionis, aut itionis quæ fit mane,* as Mr *Romaine* interprets that proper name.

But the beſt account of this name is given by *Bochart*, viz. that *Arba* was the name of a man, from whom the giants were deſcended *. And this Mr *Romaine* † ſeems moſt to approve of: and above all, this is the account that agrees beſt with Scripture: for the literal rendering of *Joſhua* xiv. 15. viz.

קרית ארבע האדם הגדל הוא would be, *the city of* Arba; *he was a great man among the* Anakims. Where our tranſlators have unneceſſarily repeated *Arba*;—*which* Arba *was a great man*, &c. And *Joſhua* xv. 14. hath it קרית ארבע אבי הענק, viz. the city of Arba, the father of Anak. And according to this interpretation there is no room for any alluſion to the *Pythagorean tetrachtys*, or *the cherubic heads*.

Neither

* *Phaleg.* L. iv. c. 34. *In expoſ.* Joſ. xiv. 15. & Lib. iv. c. 35. "Hithæus erat nimirum is *Arba* de quo dixi-"mus, cujus filius *Anak*, nepotes *Achiman*, *Seſai*, *Thal-*"*mai*, reliquiſque poſteri *Anakim*." &c.

† "*Chiriath Arbea*. Civitas ſic dicta ab *Arbea* ſive "*Arba* qui illam condidit, aut illi præfuit. Hoc autem "nomen ſortitus eſt gigas qui *quatuor* viris robore præ-"ſtaret." Nom. prop. Interp.

NEITHER will Mr *Holloway*'s ſpiritual ſenſe of כנען, viz. *the place of our pilgrimage among the negotiators of this world*, appear to have much propriety when we conſider that *Canaan* had it's name from being the place of ſettlement to the poſterity of *Canaan*, one of the ſons of *Ham*; and that כנענים, *Canaanites*, was *nomen Gentile*. And the true etymology of כנען when taken for a perſon, the ſon of *Ham*, ſeems to be from the verb כנע *humiliavit, depreſſit*; or, כנע *humiliavit*, and ענה *depreſſit*, as *Hiller* thinks, p. 332. In which ſenſe the name of *Canaan* will allude to his fortune and condition, as denounced by *Noah*, *Gen.* ix. 25.—*A ſervant of ſervants ſhall he be unto his brethren.* And hence the literal interpretation of *Canaanites*, if ſought after, will be *contriti, confracti*, rather than *mercatores*, or *negotiatores*. For as to the other etymology which Mr *Romaine* preſents us with, from כון and ענה—*recte reſpondentes*, I apprehend it ought to be ſet aſide as being very forced.

INDEED, the uſe of the word *Canaanite*, in the mercantile ſenſe, from which Mr *Holloway* chooſes to give the ſpirit of the text,

text, ſeems to have ariſen entirely from the trade that was carried on by the latter *Canaanites* *, who dwelt by the ſea coaſts, being driven by *Joſhua* out of the inland parts of the country: which is the more probable, becauſe none of the Eaſtern languages, beſides the Hebrew, uſe כנען for *a trader*. (See Dr *Caſtell.*) And therefore the word may bear a ſenſe in *Iſaiah* xxiii. 8. and *Jerem.* x. 17. and in ſome other places among the later writers, which it did not bear when *Moſes* wrote the Pentateuch. It ſhould be ſhewn, that the *Canaanites* were merchants in the days of *Abraham*; and not only, that thoſe were ſo who lived towards the ſea-coaſts, but alſo thoſe who lived towards the Eaſtern borders of the country, and where *Sichem* was ſituated, before a ſpiritual conſtruction can be taken from that uſage of the word, in the text under conſideration.

THERE ſeems no occaſion to examine Mr *Holloway*'s ſpiritual meaning of every proper name mentioned within the period prefixed:

* In the ſame manner as *Millener* in Engliſh, or *Milaner*, for it is ſpelt both ways, is ſuppoſed to come from *Milan*.

prefixed: but the chief of them, however, I ſhall briefly conſider, viz. of places *Luz*, *Hai*, *Shur*, *Bered*, and *Gerar*. Of perſons, *Abimelech*, *Phicol*, and *Ephron*. Perſons and places, whoſe names without all doubt, had been given them before *Abraham*'s ingreſs into *Canaan*.

THE old name of *Bethel* was *Luz*, *Gen.* xxviii. 19. And another city was called *Hai*, when *Abraham* firſt entered the land, *Gen.* xiii. 3.

לוז *Luz*, this is (ſays Mr *Holloway*) *the falling off, or apoſtacy*, p. 263.

העי *Ai. the perverſeneſs of heathen apoſtacy*, p. 132.

BUT is there any probability, that the *Canaanites* would deſignedly give names to their cities, expreſſive of theſe meanings?

AND though *Luz* ſignifies *diſceſſio*, yet it alſo ſignifies (ſee the indexes) *amygdalus*, an almond, or filbert-tree. And *Bochart* has proved at large, that this is the proper ſignification of it. *Phaleg.* p. 697. Mr *Romaine*, in his index, has alſo put down *corylus*: but by what authority I cannot ſay. *Hiller*, Urbs receſſus vel *amygdalene*, p. 870. And it is eaſy to ſuppoſe

ſuppoſe it might be named from the almond-tree, ſeeing we find a place called the *City of Palmtrees* עיר התמרים *Deut.* xxxiv. 3. *Judg.* i. 16. and iii. 13. and elſewhere. And ſo Tadmor, or as it is written in the 1 *Kings* ix. 18. תמר in the wilderneſs, otherwiſe called *Palmyra*, and is thought by *Schultens*, and others, to receive it's name from תמר *Palma*. It is called by the Arabs *Tedmor*, to this day; and in the deſcription of it, it is ſaid that *palms* grew there. See *Patrick* on 1 *Kings* ix. 18.

ANOTHER inſtance of the like kind we have in *Kiriath-jearim:* the City of Woods.

עיא *Aia*, or העי *Hai* ſignifies *cumulus*, *acervus*. (See the indexes) And might not this city, from it's ſituation, or ſome local circumſtance *, obtain it's name under this ſenſe of the word?

שור *Shur*. *Gen.* xvi. 7,—20. that is, (ſays Mr *Holloway*) *The contemplation of Chriſt*,

* Perhaps as being built on a rocky or ſtony ground: for this is the ſenſe of עיין the plural, without the emphatical ה. In *Mic.* iii. 12. it is ſaid of *Jeruſalem* תהיה עיין. LXX. λιθολογηθησεται. In lapidum congeriem redigetur. *Bochart. Phaleg.* p. 450.

*Chriſt, and the heavenly inheritance promiſed through him*, p. 175. But the word ſignifies, not only *aſpiciens*, but alſo *bos*, and *murus*, as the indexes teſtify. And is alſo uſed for *inimicus*, in *Pſal.* xcii. 12.

ברד. *Bered.* Gen. xvi. 14. *Deſcent*, ſays our author, importing " the deſcent of " the Word to take fleſh."——But might there not be other reaſons for calling a city by this name from local circumſtances? And beſides this ſignification, which is conjectured from ירד, it may either ſignify *grando* from ברד, or *in imperio*, from רדה with the prefix ב. (See the indexes of proper names.)

גרר *Gerar.* Gen. xx. 1. " The root, ſays our author, " of the name *Gerar*, " ſignifies to cut and poliſh ſtones. And " therefore the name itſelf ſpiritually de- " notes the place of cutting and poliſhing " the living ſtones, deſigned for the di- " vine building of the Church." p. 175. But what ſays Mr *Romaine? Ind. nom. propr.* " גרר peregrinatio ex גור, vel cer- " tatio aut conflictus ex גרה, ſive rumi- " natio ex גרר." From what root it may derive the ſenſe of poliſhing any thing, or

or of cutting ſtones rather than cutting any thing elſe, I do not know.

THEN again, as to the proper names of men.——*Abimelech* K. of *Gerar*.—— "It means, ſays Mr *Holloway*, *My Father* "*is King, or the King is my Father*.—— "This is a divine Name of the Second "Perſon, applied by abuſe to the *Philiſtines* idol, *Moloch*." p. 176. "But in "it's rectified ſpiritual interpretation, it "refers to God, the heavenly Father, "and King of all." &c. p. 200.

WHETHER the following account of this word may be acquieſced in, I know not: but it ſeems much preferable to that given by Mr *Holloway*. It is in the Polyglott Index of proper Names. אבימלך Pater Regis, ſive Regum ſummus. Rex dignitate reliquos reges antecellens. Generale nomen eſt Paleſtinorum Regum perinde atque Cæſar Romanorum Imperatorum.

פיכל *Abimelech*'s captain of the hoſt. *Gen.* xxi. 22. *Phicol*, ſays our author, "literally ſignifies *a perfect mouth*, and "therefore *muſt* ſpiritually denote a ſincere and true confeſſion, and requeſt

"to

" to be admitted into covenant with the " faithful." p. 200.

VIDE indices.——Polyg. & Rom.—— פיכל Os omnium: which they explain by *omnis lingua*, or, *oris perfectio ſive conſummatio*. But perhaps, this derivation ſhould be rather underſtood in the ſenſe of os omnium, mouth of all, or of every one, as being the moſt ſuitable to the buſineſs of the captain of an hoſt, who may properly be ſaid to be the mouth of all his ſoldiers, both as he is to give the word of command to all, and as he is to repreſent the behaviour, actions, and wants of all.

To mention but one more.

עפרון *Ephron*. Gen. xxiii. 8, 10. Pulvis, ſive hinnulus, aut plumbeus, ex עפר. See the Indexes.

*EPHRON* the ſon of *Zoar*.] *Ephron*, ſays Mr *Holloway* " ſignifies the exaltation " of the duſt; and *Zoar* the pure bright " one, the light. The iniquity of theſe " heathens was not yet full. They had " ſome notion of the divine Light with " the Reſurrection to be effected by him. " For in theſe names they appear to have " yet (in part) recognized theſe particulars,

" though

" though not without their idolatrous miſ-
" applications." *Letter and Spirit*, p. 221.

THUS the words exhibit, in our author's way, an adumbrative goſpel.

YET צהר is uſed but twice in the Scriptures. Once to ſignify *white wool*, *Ezek.* xxvii. 18. and once a *white ſhe-aſs*, *Judg.* v. 10. And on what authority then, doth Mr *Holloway* interpret it, *the pure bright one*, *the light?* It is true, the *Samaritan*, both text and verſion, reads צהר; but neither is this uſed in the ſingular number for *light*, unleſs it may ſeem to have ſomething of that ſenſe, *Gen.* xvi. 6. where we render it a window.

AND ſuppoſing further, what is quite uncertain, that *Ephron* had his name from *duſt*, what is there in it to convey the idea of exaltation alſo? even, if we conſider with our author, the Reſurrection as an exaltation of the duſt?

ALLOWING that the *Canaanites*, in impoſing of names, intended to recognize ſome great truths in Religion, (though this can never be proved) might not *the Light*, if it was ſuggeſted in part by *whiteneſs*, ſeem rather among theſe heathens

thens to have been an idea of the *material light* which God created the firſt day, of which they might have *ſome notion* becauſe tradition might inform them of it?

Or if the idea of *duſt* were intended to be at all conveyed in the name *Ephron*, may it not more reaſonably be preſumed to have been meant of the *duſt of the ground*, out of which man was formed, and to which he was doomed to return, than to the general Reſurrection? For the tradition of the former may be ſuppoſed to have remained and held as a ſacred doctrine among them; but that they ſhould have any notion of the Reſurrection ſeems improbable.

Therefore there is little reaſon, I think, for what Mr *Holloway* obſerves, when he adds —— "Theſe names there-"fore, however imperfectly or corruptly "they were born or impoſed by their "Pagan owners; yet with reſpect to the "Patriarchal tranſaction here before us, (viz. the purchaſe of *Machpelah*, for the burial of *Sarah*) "they ſignified his (*A-*"*braham*'s) hope, that the duſt of his "dead ſhould be reſtored from it's ſtate "of diſſolution in the grave, to a ſtate of

" exultation and joy, when it ſhould be " raiſed again by the Light, Chriſt." p. 221.

BUT the reader will judge for himſelf, whether Mr *Holloway* hath given a ſatisfactory account, how ſuch names came to be impoſed and borne by the Pagans, as did ſpiritually ſignify what he infers from them; or whether he hath made a proper application of thoſe names to *Abraham*'s affairs, and thereby to the concerns of Religion. For neither are his etymologies of the words always the moſt probable, nor his rectified ſenſe of the literal conſtruction of thoſe words the moſt judicious. And notwithſtanding he tells us, p. 223. that the whole *reaſon* and *analogy* of the Scriptures do ſuggeſt his method of interpretation; the reader, perhaps, from conſidering theſe ſpecimens of it, will be inclined to think of his method, (what he himſelf owns, *ibid.* ſome do think,) viz. that it is but *an arbitrary viſionary thing*.

MUCH the greateſt number of proper names, within the compaſs of the chapters to which my enquiry hath been confined, are omitted by Mr *Holloway*, either becauſe

becauſe they fall not under any immediate connexion with *Abraham*'s affairs, or tranſactions, —— or, perhaps, becauſe their ſpiritual ſenſe was not ſo obvious to him.

WHAT ſpiritual conſtruction the proper names in *Joſhua* may be capable of, in their application to the affairs of the *Iſraelites*, the people of God, on their coming to inhabit the promiſed land, I cannot ſay. Mr *Holloway* has not yet brought *his comment* ſo far down. But as far as may be gathered from an attempt or two of this kind, that have been occaſionally made by other hands, there ſeems no great proſpect of ſucceſs in purſuing this method.

ONE of them is made upon *Idalah* by the Author of the *Chriſtian Plan*, p. 27.

THE name of this place occurs in *Joſh.* xix. 15. where it is mentioned with *Bethlehem*. And therefore the learned Author ſuppoſes it " may have a myſtical mean-
" ing, as *Bethlehem* confeſſedly has. And
" the cities belonging to *Zabulon*, which
" was within the inheritance of *Judah*,
" may fairly be ſuppoſed to be more ſig-
" nificant of the properties and attributes
" of the lyon of the tribe of *Judah*, when

" they were new named by the *Iſraelites*,
" than thoſe of ſome other tribes."

BUT here are ſeveral things preſumed, I fear without authority. As,

1. THAT this place was new named by the *Iſraelites*, of which there is neither proof, nor, as I think, probability.

2. THAT though it was allotted to *Zabulon*, it was nevertheleſs within the inheritance of *Judah*. It is ſaid indeed of the lot that fell to *Simeon*, that it was within the portion of the children of *Judah*, v. 9. But it is not *ſo ſaid* of the lot that fell to *Zabulon*, and the other tribes mentioned after it, whoſe borders have their different deſcriptions.

3. NEITHER doth it's ſtanding next to *Bethlehem*, prove it to be within the inheritance of *Judah*. For this is not *Bethlehem Judah*, or *Bethlehem Ephrata*, where our Saviour was born, (and which our Author ſays hath confeſſedly a myſtical meaning, though I am not aware upon what authority he aſſerts this) but another *Bethlehem*, as all the writers on the Geography of *Canaan*, which I have ſeen, do agree.

4. AND how the lyon of *Judah*, a title no where given to Chriſt but in St *John*'s *Apocalypſe*

*Apocalypſe* ſhould be alluded to or thought of by the children of *Zabulon* when they new named the town, or how it appears that they alluded to, or thought of any lion in naming it *Idalah*, will want explaining.

THEN as to the Etymology of the word itſelf.——It is compounded according to our Author, (ſee *Chriſtian Plan*, p. 27.) " of יד a hand, and אלה. The hand is " the known emblem of power, and " emphatically deſcribes it: ſo that in this " name is intimated and implied, a con- " junction of *power*, and a curſe or oath " of execration.——And might be im- " poſed in the way of a memorial to re- " cord the wonderful tranſaction, wherein " a perſon of the Eſſence covenanted to " become *a curſe* in the fulneſs of time."

THAT it is compounded of יד and אלה, two common Hebrew words, (though probably impoſed upon the place before *Abraham*'s time) will, if indeed it be compounded of any appellative words, eaſily be allowed. *Bochart* admits the compoſition as juſt, but gives a different conſtruction of both the words.—*Videtur* Idalium Phœnicium *eſſe* ידאלה, *cujus nominis oppidum in tribu* Zabulon *memoratur*, Joſ. xix. 15.

*Hieronymus in locis* (ſc. Hebraicis) *ſcribit Iadela tanquam conflatâ voce ex duabus* יד & אלה. *Iad-ela ad verbum eſt locus Deæ*, i. e. *locus* Veneri *ſacer.* יד *ſæpe locum ſonat.* Deut. xxiii. 12. Eſa. lvi. 5. *Chanaan.* L. 1. c. 3. p. 373.—And hence *Bochart* conjectures, came Ιδαλιον Cypri *nemus et oppidum*, and alſo *Venus Idalia*, &c.

But as יד is uſed for *a place* as well as *an hand*, ſo אלה ſignifies *an oak* as well as *a curſe*. And to interpret it (if *Bochart*'s account does not pleaſe) of the *place of the oak*, as a name impoſed by the old *Canaanites* agreably to the names they gave to places, appears (to me at leaſt) more reaſonable than to interpret it of the *power of the curſe* upon the reaſons alledged in the *Chriſtian Plan.*

Yet though I have mentioned my exceptions againſt this conjecture of that learned Author, I muſt do him the juſtice to ſay that leſs exception lies againſt his manner of propoſing his opinion, which is with deference.

The other conſtruction of this kind, which I intended to ſpeak a word to, is Mr *Romaine*'s in his interpretation of *Baal-berith. Judg.* ix. 4.—" בעל ברית Templum

" lum aëri purificatori ſacrum, ex בעל
" imperans aër et בריה purificator,"—and in his interpretation of אל בריה, the God *Berith*. *Judg*. ix. 46. where he ſpeaks of the word *Berith*, as denoting *the great purifier who cleanſeth us from all ſin*, and denoting *his religion alſo*, &c.

But theſe points are advanced by him on no other foundation, than Mr *Hutchinſon*'s peculiar conſtructions of בעל by the *ruling air*, and בריה by *purifier*. Which conſtructions Mr *Romaine* hath ſupperadded to the interpretations both of *Baal* and *Berith* given in the index of proper names at the end of the *London Polyglot*; as he hath occaſionally added to that index in ſome other inſtances, what he took and approved of upon Mr *Hutchinſon*'s authority.

But the reader will find other accounts of this proper name in *Hiller*'s Onom, who interprets it by Jupiter fœderalis, or Jupiter Beryto advectus *p*. 758. and in *Bochart's Canaan*, L. II. c. 17. p. 859. And in *Gale*'s *Court of the Gentiles*, Part, 2. c. 3. Sect. 8. p. 51. 4to.—The ſubſtance of which accounts from *Bochart* and *Gale* is, that *Baal-berith* was the idol or goddeſs worſhipped at *Berytus*,

a city within the *tribe* of *Ephraim*, and well known afterwards,—that both the city and its goddeſs are called *Beroë* (the pronunciation of the name being ſoftned) by the Poet *Nonnus* in his *Dionyſiac's*.—— That ſhe was according to that Poet the daughter of *Venus* and *Adonis*, but according to others of *Thetis* and *Oceanus*, and that ſhe was worſhipped in thoſe parts. *Bochart* accounts for בעל being uſed of a goodeſs,* and inſiſts on the word *Berith* being feminine *quia hebraicè* ברית *ſemper eſt fœmininum*. Nor is it any objection to this (as he obſerves) that the *Iſraelites* ſet her up לאלהים *Judg.* viii. 33. becauſe the Hebrews applied אלהים to a goddeſs, as well as to a god, as in the 1 *Kings* xi. 5, and 33. *Aſtarte* the goddeſs (אלהי) of the *Sidonians*.

But to conclude this ſubject of the proper names in *Canaan*. When the *Iſralites* after they took poſſeſſion of the land changed the old names of their cities for

* Thus alſo the Polyglot index on the word *Baal*.—— "Eſt *propriè* idolum Sidoniorum 1 Reg. xvi. 31. quod "idolum aliter dicitur *Aſtoreth*. Accipitur etiam pro quo- "cunque idolo."—Which laſt expreſſion Mr *Romaine* thinks proper to limit in his index by adding—*Aëri ſacro*.

for new ones, we commonly find the old name as properly Hebrew, as the new name they changed it for; and ſometimes likewiſe pretty much to the ſame ſignification. Thus קרית ספר *Kiriath Sepher*, urbs librorum, LXX πολις γραμματων. *Joſh.* xv. 15. was changed into דבר. Which city was likewiſe called (or perhaps it's name was firſt changed into) קרית סנה *Kiriah Senna*, civitas Rubi, and afterwards called *Debir*, *Joſh.* xv. 49. Thus חצר גדה v. 27. *Hazzar* Gaddah, atrium agminis vel turmæ equeſtris, is no doubt the ſame with חצר סוסה *Hazzar Suſa*, atrium equi, *Joſh.* xix. 5. and with חצר סוסים atrium equorum or copiarum equeſtrium 1 *Chron.* iv. 31. In which laſt text it is mentioned, in company with the ſame cities, whoſe names accompany it in *Joſh.* xix. 5. And what is further obſervable in this laſt text, the *Syriac* and *Arabic* tranſlators inſtead of חצר סוסים retain חצר גדה. And both ſeem to be *Canaanitiſh* names, becauſe the *Iſraelites* who did not make uſe of *Horſe-militia* were not likely to impoſe ſuch names.

BUT though we cannot be certain what changes the *Iſraelites* might make in

in the names of the cities when they took poſſeſſion of them, yet the inſtances above-given of proper Hebrew names impoſed on men and places in *Canaan* in *Abraham*'s time, ſufficiently prove that Hebrew was anciently the vernacular language of that country.

If the reader ſhall think I have dwelt too long upon this head, and eſpecially in examining Mr *Holloway*'s myſtical interpretations of proper names, I muſt beg he would remember the great authority that is aſcribed to them by that Reverend Author, and the mighty ſtreſs that he lays upon them, even ſo far as to look upon thoſe to be in a piteous caſe who think his method of ſpiritual interpretation *arbitrary* or *fanciful*. I am perſuaded that all who *think ſo*, will the more readily excuſe what I have ſaid, in order to ſhew that ſeveral of thoſe interpretations (by which the reſt may be pretty certainly judged of, as being formed upon the ſame plan) deſerve no better a character. And I muſt alſo ſeriouſly deſire the friends of ſuch interpretations to conſider, whether, though ſuch expoſitions may be called ſpiritual in the ſenſe of pious and devout, yet the

giving

giving out magiſterially ſuch groundleſs conceits and unlikely conjectures as the meaning of the Spirit of God, may not rather tend to create irreverence to the word of God, than to do it the honour that the deviſer of them aims at; to hurt Chriſtianity rather than enlarge it's evidence; and be more likely to heighten the contempt of the Holy Scriptures among unbelievers, than to promote and aſſiſt the faith of thoſe who reverence the ſacred writings upon ſufficient evidence of their truth from reaſonable and grounded teſtimonies.

SECT.

## SECT. III.

*The aſſertion that the Biblical Hebrew was the language in Paradiſe, fully conſidered.*

IT has been laid down as an undeniable concluſion, from Mr *Hutchinſon*'s *New Account*, &c. that the *preſent Hebrew, in which* Moſes *writ, muſt be the language of Paradiſe.* (Evidence for Chriſtianity, p. 92.) " For the language ſpoken " before the affair at *Babel*, was the lan- " guage of *Adam*. Mr *Hutchinſon* has " proved, that the ſame language which " was ſpoken before, continued to be " ſpoken by all men down to, and at the " time of *Moſes*. Therefore the Bibli- " cal Hebrew is the language of Para- " diſe."

BUT although theſe premiſes were right, yet this conſequence is not juſtly drawn:

drawn: at leaſt it will require ſome explanation to limit it to a ſenſe in which it may be admitted.

FOR, whoſoever conſiders the nature of language, will be ready to allow, that the change which the firſt language muſt undergo in the compaſs of 1800 years, would be conſiderable; ſo that although the language ſpoken immediately *before the affair at Babel*, might in one ſenſe have been called the ſame with the language in Paradiſe; as ſeveral of the names of animals might be preſerved, and remain in uſage the ſame they were when firſt impoſed; and as the roots of words for the moſt ſimple ideas, and the moſt common actions of life, might continue in uſe through ſo many ages; yet it might not be the ſame in another ſenſe, but be ſo altered by increaſe of words, and new inflexions, applications, and conſtructions of them, that the generations after the Flood, could they have heard the tongue ſpoke by the Antediluvians above 1600 years before, would not in all probability have underſtood it, or have taken it at firſt hearing to have been the ſame that they ſpake themſelves. And if in this

ſenſe they were called *different languages*, it would be, I think, according to our common notion and acceptation of thoſe terms.

THE firſt inhabitants of the earth were few in number, occupied in few things, and had not occaſion for that variety of words, which their deſcendants were obliged to make uſe of for the many new things in which they were engaged, or about which they were employed. So that as Arts were invented, and as Science was improved, language on courſe would be enlarged, new words, and technical terms coined, and the ſenſes of words already in uſe multiplied, by being extended and transferred to ſubjects to which they had not been before applied, as well as by their being uſed figuratively, or in ſenſes of accommodation. In which gradual culture of language each ſucceeding generation would improve upon the former. And this improvement in different families, or tribes, would not probably be juſt the ſame, but be made in different degrees, and in a manner alſo ſomething different; till the language originally derived from the *firſt pair*, was rendered

ſufficiently

ſufficiently copious and extenſive, not only to ſerve all the ends of life, and converſation in each family, or tribe, as then conſtituted and governed, but likewiſe to anſwer all the purpoſes of mutual intelligence, and correſpondence with the reſt of mankind.

IT has been the fate of all languages, as I apprehend, while they were *living ones*, to be liable to ſuch change and alterations as cuſtom is found to introduce into thoſe which are ſpoken at preſent. And though it be truly obſerved, that the Hebrew tongue appears to have had leſs change made in it while it was a living language, than any other whereof we have ſpecimens extant in writings of different ages, yet there are ſome peculiar reaſons to be alledged for this. The ſeparation of the *Iſraelites* from all other nations, and the diverſity of their religious Inſtitutions, Laws, and Cuſtoms from thoſe of all other people, and their abſtaining from commerce, or communication with the Gentile world, would greatly contribute to the ſtability and preſervation of their language in the ſtate it was left by *Moſes:* though whether ſo effectually

tually as to prevent *all* foreign mixtures, or even the coinage of *ſome* new terms, may be very juſtly queſtioned; for there are inſtances of words, generally eſteemed not to be genuine Hebrew, but to have been either framed by the Hebrews, or adopted into their language from other tongues, or dialects.

Mr *Hutchinſon* himſelf, who contends for it's being the primitive tongue, ſcruples not, I think, to ſpeak ſomething to this purpoſe; *Introd. to Moſes ſine Princ.* p. 18.——"So whatever things, &c. the "Hebrews had, or had knowledge of, "*and ſo framed proper words for*, and the "*Greeks*, *Latins*, &c. had not, nor had "any knowledge of, they framed no "words or names for them." When, or where this was done by the Hebrews, he does not ſay; but ſo far as I can gather from his foregoing paragraph, he means it of words *framed to raiſe true ideas of the things*, *actions*, *offices*, *places*, *and times peculiar to that people*; and which, indeed, if I do not miſunderſtand him, leaves room to infer, that there are numbers of words in the Scriptures, which were framed by the Hebrews after they became a peculiar

a peculiar people. And if they did this to give true ideas of their own *things*, *offices*, &c. who will doubt but they and their forefathers, or the perſons from whom they received the language, did frame new words, new terms of ſpeech, from time to time, as neceſſity, convenience, and enlargement of knowledge required?

PERHAPS a reaſon may be gathered from hence, why ſome words are found in the latter Prophets, which are not to be met with in the *Pentateuch*; and a ſuppoſition by parity of reaſon may be well ſupported, viz. that ſeveral words might have been uſed by *Moſes* in the *Pentateuch*, (beſides all the compounded words for names of places or perſons) which were not in uſe in the times of *Nimrod* and *Heber*, and that ſeveral words might be part of the one language at *Shinaar*, which were not in uſe before the Flood; and ſeveral alſo might have been in common uſe in the Ages of *Methuſaleh*, *Lamech*, and *Noah*, which were unknown in the days of *Adam*, *Seth*, or *Enos*.

I HAVE ſpoken hitherto of words framed, or differently inflected for the *im-*

*provement* of the language, and have taken no notice of the *perverſion* of words from their original meaning, by perverſe men; by which the language would be corrupted rather than amended, and made to degenerate from it's native purity.

I RESIGN the explanation of this to Mr *Holloway*, who tells us, (*Letter and Spirit*, p. 109.) that "*the apoſtate world*, (ſo he expounds *the earth*, Gen. xi. 1.) "*beſides one original tongue or ſpeech, had* "*all one ſtile, or manner of talk, accord-* "*ing to the religion and philoſophy of* Cain, "*then revived*;" that is, as I preſume his meaning to be, they perverted the original uſe of words, (eſpecially ſuch as were appropriated to ſacred truths and inſtitutions) to wicked purpoſes, to the advancement of their own idolatries, and in contempt of the true Religion.

AND he gives us in the next page, (viz. 110.) a very early inſtance of this kind of abuſe of words by *Cain* himſelf, whoſe religion and philoſophy were, he ſays, revived after the Flood. For on the words in *Gen.* xi. 4. *Let us build us a city*, נבנה לנו עיר, he remarks,

"*THAT*

"*THAT is, according to the ſigni-*
"*fication of the Hebrew name for city, a*
"*place elevated, or raiſed up in oppoſition*
"*and hoſtility againſt the Lord.*—— For
"*Cain, in oppoſition and contempt of the*
"*true Tabernacle and types of elevation,*
"*raiſing,* &c. *built what we call a city,*
"*and named it in rebellious mockery, by that*
"*holy word* עיר, *(from* עור *to awake, rouſe,*
"*riſe, raiſe up,*" &c.) which muſt have been uſed, from the beginning, of the tabernacle or place of worſhip given to *Adam* after the Fall, according to the ſame author. See more to the ſame purpoſe in p. 110, 111.

Now if the caſe really was as he repreſents it, here is a new ſenſe given to a Hebew word, which was *not* it's ſenſe in the language of *Adam*; but the noun is *perverted* from it's original meaning, and applied to another Subject, or what *we call a city*. And though it was thus applied at firſt in rebellious mockery of the true Religion, yet it hath continued under that application as a proper Hebrew word; and is uſed frequently by *Moſes*, not only for the heathen and idolatrous cities belonging to the poſterity of *Ham*, but for

the cities of the people of God, even thoſe appointed for the uſes of their religion and laws. As the cities ערי *of the Levites*, *Lev.* xxv. 32. *& alibi.* ערי מקלט *Cities of Refuge*, Numb. xxxv. 11. *& alibi.* And if one word was thus made to deviate from it's firſt and proper ſignification by *Cain*, numberleſs other words might have been alſo abuſed by him, and his wicked poſterity, after the ſame manner; and a conſiderable change might have been made in the Paradiſiacal language by this means, which Mr *Holloway* ſuppoſes to have been, in one inſtance, taken.

And if the Hebrew really was, and could be proved to have been an ideal language in Paradiſe, of what uſe would this knowledge be to us, if, nevertheleſs, the language was tranſmitted to us through the hands of thoſe who could arbitrarily fix new ideas, and give new ſignifications to words which did not correſpond with their primitive and true meaning? unleſs we *certainly* knew, (and it ſeems impoſſible to know it *certainly*) what thoſe words in the language were, which have wholly eſcaped this injury and abuſe.

And if it be further conſidered, that the poſterity of *Seth*, and the poſterity of *Cain* were for ſome time ſeparated, during which time *the one language* would undergo different alterations in the two reſpective lines; and then again were mixed together by intermarriages, which on courſe would produce a compound language with all the improvements, or all the diſadvantages it had received during their ſeparation; we may eaſily conceive how much the language of Paradiſe muſt have been changed in the days of *Noah* and his ſons, from what it had originally been: and that in the XVIIth Century of the world, the one language of mankind was not in all reſpects the ſame with *that* of *Adam*.

And it is ſcarce credible that further changes ſhould not have been made in it upon *Noah*'s family coming, as it were, into a new world; wherein many things muſt appear to them without precedent, or example, in the old world. Perhaps, the whole method of cultivating the ground might be different from what it had been, as it is generally thought the earth was not in the ſame ſtate after the

Deluge, that it was in before it. And ſome have ſuppoſed the ſtate of the clouds and meteors was different alſo. Then it was that *Noah* began to be an huſbandman; and he planted a vine-yard. And making wine is eſteemed to have been his invention; to whom alſo the firſt grant was given of eating fleſh. Theſe alterations in nature, as well as in diet, would occaſion new terms in things of common experience and uſage; the number of which terms would probably ſtill increaſe, as mankind did. From all which reaſons, it is to be preſumed, that the *Noachical* language, or that which was ſpoken in the laſt age of the *Antediluvian* world, would receive many additions to it, more or leſs advantageous, till the days of *Heber*, and *Peleg*, in whoſe time the earth was divided.

INDEED, if this had not been the ſtate of the primæval language, (whether it were Hebrew or not) it would have been a ſtanding miracle, and harder to account for than the miracle wrought at *Babel*, which Mr *Bate* ſays, has *proved ſuch an unfortunate rock to the learned, that many of them have made ſhipwreck there of their common*

*mon ſenſe.* (Scripture meaning of Aleim, p. 88.)

But, if the ſtate of the firſt language was, as I have been repreſenting, upon the moſt reaſonable ſuppoſition we can make, upon a ſubject on which we are obliged, for want of *data*, to uſe conjectures: What becomes of Mr *Moody*'s concluſion, that if Hebrew was the language before, and at the time of the affair at *Babel*, then the Scriptures were wrote in the language of Paradiſe? which is much ſuch a kind of inference as I ſhould make in ſaying, If *Engliſh* was the language of our country in King *Henry* the VIIIth's time, then Mr *Moody* has wrote his book, intitled, *Evidence for Chriſtianity*, in the language of the age of *Henry* the Iſt: which is in *one* ſenſe true; in *another* it is *not* ſo. It is the ſame language, as it hath been continued under various changes, yet hath never been loſt, or totally altered. The proper names of men, countries, cities, rivers, mountains, &c. are preſerved, for the moſt part, the ſame they were. Many of the appellatives, terms of art, of action, of office, &c. and many of the particles are the ſame

alſo. And yet, in other reſpects, the language is ſo different now, from what it then was, that a perſon living 600 years ago, would have been as little able to underſtand the *Engliſh* of the preſent age, as the ordinary people now are able to underſtand the *Engliſh* wrote in the reign of *Henry* the Iſt. *.

And thus, as I take it, Mr *Moody*'s aſſertion ſtands, in regard to the language of *Moſes*, and the language of Paradiſe being *the ſame*. Which, although it may be true in a ſenſe, that will do him little ſervice towards ſupporting the inferences he would draw from their ſuppoſed identity; yet is *not true*, or rather, cannot, without the greateſt improbability, be affirmed to be ſo, in the only ſenſe that will ſerve his purpoſe, viz. that all, or moſt of the words uſed by *Moſes*, were words in uſe at the beginning of the world; or, that *Moſes* could deſcribe nothing concerning the formation of the world, or the

* Note. It was in the latter end of this reign when *Saxon* took a form, which is reputed to be the beginning of the *Engliſh* tongue, as diſtinguiſhed from the old *Saxon*. And there are ſeveral ſpecimens of it in this it's early ſtate, in the *Saxon* Chronicles from 1130 to the end.

the firſt ſtate of mankind, by any words framed in after-ages, or ſince the diſperſion at *Babel*, however common in uſe they might be in his time, and familiar to thoſe *Hebrews*, for whoſe inſtruction and benefit he wrote the account of thoſe things.

And this way of reaſoning ſtands equally good, I apprehend, upon Mr *Holloway*'s ſcheme of proving the primævity of the *Hebrew*, viz. that *Heber and his friends*, not being partakers in the crime at *Babel*, *retained the original ſacred language*, with their *faith*, and *underſtanding entire, and unhurt*. (*Letter and Spirit*, p. 122.) That is, they retained the one language of the world, as it was ſpoke by the deſcendants of *Noah*, in *Heber*'s days, and before it was loſt or divided among the projectors at *Shinaar*. For he cannot mean, I think, that *Heber*, and the faithful with him, retained a different language (though he uſes the word *ſacred*) from that which was ſpoken by *Ham*'s poſterity before their diſperſion; becauſe he ſays, p. 109. that "*the revolters, or* "*apoſtate world, beſides the one original* "*tongue, or ſpeech, had all one ſtile or* "*manner*

" *manner of talk.*"——And at p. 114. " *Beſides their being united in the original* " *language, they were confederated, as the* " *Pſalmiſt expreſſes it, in an evil word or* " *ſpeech.*"

So that although *Heber and his friends* did not uſe the ſame impious ſtile, or manner of talk, that the apoſtates did, nor aſſociate with them either in their evil words or evil deſigns; yet they could not retain any other language than that which was before the Confuſion, common to all. And therefore, although *Moſes* ſhould be ſuppoſed to have wrote in the ſame language that *Heber* retained, yet it might be, for the reaſons above given, as different from the language ſpoken in Paradiſe, as the preſent *Engliſh* differs from that which was ſpoke 600 years ago.

But there is not that evidence, I think, that *Moſes* wrote in the language which is ſuppoſed to be retained by *Heber*, &c. and tranſmitted through the Patriarchal line, that there is of his writing in the language of *Canaan*, which the children of *Iſrael* ſpake when they came out of *Egypt*, viz. the language which *Abraham* found in *Canaan* when he came firſt thither,

ther, though perhaps, at the egreſs of his poſterity out of *Egypt* ſomething altered, as it well might be in the courſe of ſo many years.

As *Abraham* was a *Syrian* by birth, there is no room to ſuppoſe otherwiſe, than that he was bred up in the *Syrian* language, and converſed chiefly in it till his removal from *Haran* into *Canaan*, where the great affinity between the two dialects would make the latter ſoon eaſy and familiar to him. Mr *Hutchinſon*, indeed, ſeems to make no difference between the two languages; but the Scripture doth, as early as the return of *Jacob* from *Padan-Aran*. And Mr *Holloway* doth not ſeem to diſallow the difference, by what he obſerves on an expreſſion in the *Targum* of *Jonathan*, upon the impoſition of the name *Mahanaim* by *Jacob*, viz. " And he called the name of the place " in the language of the houſe of the " ſanctuary, *Mahanaim*, as if (ſays Mr " *Holloway*) the pure Hebrew language " had been reſerved for ſacred uſes, and " the *Aramitiſh* had been vulgar to *Jacob* " and his family, even at that time." (*Letter and Spirit*, p. 282.)

THAT

THAT *Laban* the *Syrian* (Heb. הארמי) ſo called *Gen.* xxv. 20. talked in the *Aramitiſh* dialect there is proof from *Gen.* xxxi. 47.——That *Jacob* and his family which he had gotten in *Padan-aram* did ſo too, while he ſtayed there, little doubt can be made; although he had himſelf lived long enough in *Canaan* to be perfectly acquainted with *Canaanitiſh*, which was alſo his native tongue; and probably he might teach it in his family while he was yet in *Syria*. But that Hebrew ſhould have been the cuſtomary language of the line of *Shem*, or particularly of that family to which *Abraham* belonged, is no where ſaid, nor can be proved; at leaſt not proved by any other argument than what gives equal evidence of Hebrew being the vernacular tongue of *Canaan*; and that is the correſpondence of proper names given to *Heber's* deſcendants (in the tenth of *Geneſis*) with the Hebrew tongue. And yet this circumſtance that *Laban*, the ſon of *Bethuel*, ſon of *Nahor*, *Abraham*'s brother, talked the *Aramitiſh*, appears on the other hand to make againſt it. For if Hebrew had been the common language

language of *Abraham*'s houſe and kindred in *Syria*, it ſeems unaccountable how it ſhould have been ſo ſoon forgotten, or ſo ſoon changed in that family, immediately as it were upon *Abraham*'s leaving them, as if he had carried it wholly away with him when he removed from *Haran*.

And it ſeems as unaccountable, if it were not the language of the old *Canaanites*, how *Abraham*, a foreigner, and a ſojourner among them, with a ſmall retinue at firſt, ſhould be able in ſo ſhort a time to introduce the Hebrew into all the borders of *Canaan*, and to perſuade ſo many different tribes and diſtinct communities, who had among them the whole power and dominion of the land, to quit their own dialect, whatever it was, and to embrace and uſe his: eſpecially as he appears to have had no other commerce or communication with them, than the neceſſities of his peregrination and temporary ſojournments among them required. Or if he may be ſuppoſed to have had this extraordinary influence over them during his own time, and that the ſame effects of it were continued in the times of

of his ſon and grandſon; yet it is as ſtrange that after the departure of his family for above 200 years, the *Canaanites* ſhould not return again to their old language, had it really been a different one from the Hebrew.

*BOCHART* delivers his opinion upon this queſtion in ſuch a manner, as neither to ſay that *Abraham* taught the *Canaanites* Hebrew, or that he learned it from them, or that he did not talk *Syriac* while he was in his father's houſe and on the ſide of the Flood. But he ſuppoſes that Hebrew, as it was ſpoke in the houſe of *Heber*, (from whence he aſſerts it took it's name) was preſerved in it's purity, while that which the *Canaanites* ſpoke, as tranſmitted to them by their anceſtors, was leſs pure, though the ſame language.

AND indeed it will follow on *Bochart*'s ſuppoſitions, that the old Patriarchal *Antebabel* language eſcaped the confuſion two ways, *viz.* by the *Canaanites*, through God's Providence preſerving it in their colonies for the future uſe of the Hebrews, who were to poſſeſs the land; and by the Patriarch *Heber*, as a ſacred *depoſitum* for the uſe of his poſterity and of *Abraham*

*ham* in particular.——And on theſe ſuppoſitions it muſt follow, that it would be retained in greater purity in that family where it was in the mouths of a few, and tranſmitted by inſtruction, as dead languages now are, than among the *Canaanites* where it was the vernacular tongue, and more liable for that reaſon to thoſe alterations that languages in common uſe in any country are found by experience to undergo.

BUT all that I am concerned to remark at preſent is, that allowing it was alſo retained as *Bochart* thinks in *Heber*'s family in greater purity, and that *Moſes* uſed it in the ſame degree of purity that *Heber* ſpoke it in, ſtill it was only *that language* of the old world which was ſpoken immediately before the confuſion at *Babel*. And how *that* can be called the language of *Adam*, or the language of Paradiſe, otherwiſe than is explained above, hath not been ſhewn; neither can it, I conceive, be ſhewn to be the *ſame language* in any ſuch ſenſe, as will ſupport the concluſions which are drawn from that ambiguous expreſſion.

SECT.

## SECT. IV.

*An Examination of ſome further particulars touching the primævity of the Hebrew Tongue.*

THAT the one language of the earth was not utterly loſt, but is that which was, and is now called, the Hebrew, is a ſentiment which has been long and greatly favoured. So that *Ravis* had ſome reaſon to ſay (as Mr *Bate* tells me, in his Scripture meaning of *Aleim*, p. 56. *that all the beſt authors*, (by which I preſume he meant *many* of the beſt authors) *do earneſtly contend to have Hebrew eſcape the confuſion. Some* indeed have done their beſt to prove it. And *moſt* of them have ſhewn a great partiality (which, on account of it's motive, I will not blame) on that ſide of the queſtion. But when Mr *Bate* adds with ſeeming pleaſure

as

as a conſequence of this——*Ravis, and all the beſt authors are on our ſide*, I muſt beg leave to aſk him how this can be? When he with Mr *Hutchinſon*, (and all on that ſide who aſſert there was no confuſion of *languages* at all at *Babel*, but only a confuſion of *confeſſions*) are in that point againſt *Ravis* and *all authors*? From what did Hebrew, as a language eſcape according to their *new account of the confuſion*?

He adds further *(ibid.) Let the Doctor produce one man of note who ſays otherwiſe.* ——I might refer him, were it neceſſary to ſatisfy his demand, to *Theodoret Syrus*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, among the Ancients, *Grotius*, *Huetius*, *R. Simon* among the Moderns, and to ſome of our learned countrymen of no ſmall note whom I could name: but he doth not ſeem to have any right to make this challenge till he himſelf ſhall produce, at leaſt one man of note, who hath interpreted the tranſaction at *Babel* in the manner that Mr *Hutchinſon* hath done.

I am by no means diſpoſed to diſparage the Hebrew tongue in any reſpect. But inſtead of making an eſtimate of it from

what the Rabbinical Jews have ſaid about it, (not only without any authority, but, I think, irrationally) or from what ſome very worthy men and good Chriſtians have advanced, in the abundance of their hearts, *for a demonſtration of it's ſupreme dignity and pre-eminence*, &c. (See Preface to the Chriſtian Plan, *p.* 8, 9.) I ſhould rather chuſe to judge of it with impartiality, and to ſpeak of it with caution, and according to the beſt intelligence we can get concerning it, and according to the moſt rational concluſions, or moſt probable inferences we can make from thence.

THE Hebrew Scriptures contain ſome words which there is all reaſon to ſuppoſe were thoſe very names which *Adam* gave to animals in Paradiſe; and ſome verbs alſo, from whence thoſe nouns are derived; unleſs the verbs themſelves (as Mr *Hutchinſon* appears to have thought,) are to be referred to thoſe names as their roots. Some alſo of the proper names of the *Antediluvians* are tranſmitted thereby with their ſignifications, in Hebrew, whence certain roots (though ſome of them are common to other of the oriental tongues) are known to have been part

of

of the language of the old world. And we have this intelligence concerning proper names and their ſignifications (among other things of infinitely greater value and concern to us) from one of the moſt authentic, as well as by much the earlieſt writer in the world.

BUT doth it follow from hence that the Hebrew, *as we have it in the Bible*, was the language of *Adam* in Paradiſe, as Mr *Moody* and the *author of the Chriſtian Plan* conclude? Or that it was the univerſal language of the whole earth continued down to *Moſes*'s time without any other language interfering with it, as Mr *Hutchinſon* and Mr *Bate* ſuppoſe? Or that it intirely eſcaped the Confuſion, as *Ravis* and others have contended? Or that it eſcaped the Confuſion only in the line of *Shem*, and it did not eſcape it in the poſterity of *Ham*, as Mr *Holloway* conjectures?

NONE of theſe concluſions can be juſtly drawn; none of theſe hypotheſes can be reaſonably built on thoſe few remains of the primæval tongue which the Scriptures have preſerved to us in the etymologies, *&c.* Becauſe it was to be

expected in conſequence of the Confuſion at *Babel*, according to the Scripture account of it, that ſome fragments of the original tongue would be preſerved in all the dialects that were formed out of it's ruins. That Hebrew has it's ſhare of them is not to be doubted. But that it is the language itſelf of the old world, eſcaping the cataſtrophe at *Babel*, and preſerved pure and intire in the line of the Patriarchs, will require other proofs than the etymological: becauſe they are neither evidence of *no Confuſion*, nor of Hebrew eſcaping the Confuſion, if there was one.

MR *Holloway* as I obſerved in the firſt Section, has in his *Letter and Spirit*, ſaid enough to ſhew the miſtake of ſuppoſing there was *no confuſion* of language. He proves that *ſhaphah*, *lip*, is uſed for language, *p.* 120,—124, He tells us that "there is a general tradition in the Eaſt "that *Peleg* the ſon of *Heber* was ſo "named prophetically by his father for "a ſign and monument of the diſperſion "of the nations *by the diviſion of tongues*. "—That *Pſal.* lv. ver. 9, in particular "refers to the *means* of the diviſion of "the

" the nations *by the diviſion of tongues.*——
" Swallow up, O Lord, and divide (He-
" brew, *Palleg*) their tongues. Which
" likewiſe admirably deſcribes the very
" manner of that confuſion; as ſufficiently
" intimating two things. 1ſt, That the
" ſubſtance of the one original language,
" was firſt ſunk, and, as it were, ſwallow-
" ed up in a vaſt chaos of univerſal bab-
" ble: And 2dly, That out of that bab-
" ble, or jargon, it was again (by another
" act) divided or broken into many parti-
" cular diſſonant dialects, or tongues."
*Letter and Spirit*, p. 125.

Now, if this was the caſe, By what evidence doth it appear, (if one may preſume to aſk ſuch a queſtion) that the Hebrew might not have been one of theſe particular dialects or tongues, into which the one original language was thus divided and broken?

Mr *Holloway*'s ſaying, that the confuſion of tongues was confined to the progeny of *Ham*, doth not well conſiſt with what he ſays about *Peleg*'s being ſo named as a monument of the diſperſion of the nations, *by the diviſion of tongues*; and about the Pſalmiſt's referring in the words

——פלג לשונם——to the MEANS of the diviſion of the nations BY THE DIVISION OF TONGUES. For, if there was *no diviſion* of tongues among *Shem*'s progeny as well as *Ham*'s, or if the *ſaid diviſion* did not at all affect the family of *Heber*, how comes *Peleg*, one of *Shem*'s deſcendants, and one of *Heber*'s ſons, to be denominated from *this diviſion*; or prophetically named for a ſign of an event in which *Shem*'s race, (and *Heber*'s family in particular) had no concern? It may be ſaid, indeed, that according to *Geneſis* x. 25. *Peleg*'s name was given him, *becauſe in his days the earth was divided*; an event that affected the whole poſterity of *Noah*. But though others may alledge this, yet Mr *Holloway* cannot conſiſtently do ſo. Becauſe *the earth*, which was divided in the days of *Peleg*, is the very ſame with what is called the *whole earth*, Gen. xi. Which is reſtrained by him, p. 109. to the *apoſtate world*, the *wicked progeny of* Ham, with whom *Heber* took no part, and had no connexion. And in this ſenſe of *earth*, as confined to *Ham*'s line, (and הארץ, *Gen.* x. 25. cannot be interpreted differently from כל ארץ, *Gen.* xi. 1.) there

there is no more reaſon to think *Peleg* ſhould be named from it's *diſperſion*, than from the *diviſion of it's language*.

But what, above all, bears hard on Mr *Holloway*'s diſtinction, and indeed, overthrows it, is, (a circumſtance that not only Mr *Hutchinſon*, but many of the beſt authors contend for, viz.) that Hebrew was the language of old *Canaan*. So that if it were as generally allowed, as it is poſitively aſſerted by Mr *Holloway*, that *Heber*, and his friends and family, ſpoke the Hebrew, this can be no proof that they were exempted from the effects of the confuſion at *Babel*, ſince the *Canaanites*, who were deſcended from thoſe, whoſe *language*, by his own account, was *confounded*, talked Hebrew too. For if Hebrew could become the language of *Canaan* after the diviſion of tongues, or in conſequence of that diviſion, Why might it not become the language of the line of *Heber*, in conſequence alſo of the ſaid diviſion? Thus the ground of his diſtinction is taken away; by *Heber*'s line ſtanding on the ſame footing with the *Canaanites*, in reſpect of language: *Both of them* uſing the primæval, or Noachic, if

there was *no confuſion* of tongues; or *both of them* ſpeaking the ſame dialect, formed after the Confuſion, if the primæval, or Noachic language was *divided* and *broken* into many dialects, as Mr *Holloway* conceives.

THAT the *Phenician* tongue, (another term for the *Canaanitiſh)* was the ſame language that was ſpoke in *Heber*'s line, with this only difference, that by the latter it was preſerved in greater purity, is acknowledged not only by *Bochart*, as is remarked above, but by *Gerh. Voſſius*, *Lud. Capellus*, *Poſtellus*, *Selden*, *Walton*, *Brerewood*, and others. And though there are as many great names to be produced in favour of it's being alſo the primæval language, yet it is to be obſerved, that the argument on which that ſentiment is founded, (which is Dr *Walton*'s *Præcipuum & maximi ponderis argumentum)* viz. *that the proper names of the Ante-diluvians, and downwards to the time of the Confuſion, are Hebrew by interpretation*, is not without it's competitors, or arguments drawn from the very ſame topic, in favour of ſome others of the oriental dialects; particularly the *Chaldee*, or old *Syriac*; which hath

hath moſtly the ſame roots from whence the *antediluvian* names are taken, and thoſe roots have the ſame ſignification that they have in Hebrew. This *George Amira* hath ſhewn; ſo have the authors of *the Univerſal Hiſtory*, in the chapter on the confuſion of languages: And it is confeſſed by Dr *Walton* himſelf, as true for the moſt part. Not that this may be alledged in proof that the *Chaldee* muſt be the primitive language, as it was thought to be by *Theodoret*, *Cambden*, *Myricæus*, and others. But it is only a proof that in both the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* there are preſerved certain words that were uſed in the original language of the world. I ſhall only add, that *Erpenius* thought the arguments brought for the primævity of the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* reſpectively, were ſo equally ballanced, that he choſe to leave the diſpute as he found it.

But Mr *Holloway* thinks, (*Remarks* on Dr *Sharp*'s pieces, p. 16.) " The deciſion " of *Joſeph Scaliger*, viz. *Summam eſſe im-* " *peritiam*, &c. It is the greateſt mark of " ignorance to fancy the *Syriac* tongue to " be more ancient than the *Hebrew*,—— " *may ſerve to lay the ſpirit of Scepticiſm on*

" *the*

" *the point*——and to ſet aſide the plauſi-
" bleneſs of thoſe arguments againſt the
" Hebrew primævity, which *the Doctor*
" had in his mind."

BUT, I apprehend, with ſubmiſſion, that *Scaliger*'s judgment in this paſſage, is to be pleaded no further, than that it is not *ſo likely* that *Hebrew* ſhould be derived from, or be a dialect of the *Syriac*, *as* that *Syriac* ſhould be derived from, or be a dialect of the *Hebrew*. It may be a mark of *unſkilfulneſs* in thoſe languages, or inattention to them, *to fancy the Syriac more ancient than the Hebrew*; yet it may be no mark of either, to fancy that neither of them is the primæval language of the earth, though both of them partake of it, or have their ſhare of words, which did belong to it while it was in being, and the only language in being; ſome of which words they hold in common, ſome in ſeveralty, yet blended in either caſe with a variety of other words, of which it doth not appear that they were parts of the primitive language, but were probably additions made to each, at, or after the Confuſion.

THE

THE inſtance that *Scaliger* gave, and which is quoted by Mr *Holloway*, as ſufficient of itſelf, *to refute the abſurd notion of Syriac being more ancient than Hebrew*, (ibid.) viz. *that* "מלך *Melach*, *muſt be be-* "*fore* מלכא *Melcha*," is ſurely ſomething unlucky: becauſe the *former* word is no leſs *Syriac* than the *latter*; and מלכי (the ſame in ſenſe with מלכא or מלכה, all three being *Syriac* words) is no leſs Hebrew than מלך. No leſs biblical Hebrew, for מלכי צדק *Melchiſedech* occurs, *Gen.* xiv. 18. and *Pſal.* cx. 4.

BY another like example, *Scaliger* might have argued, that Hebrew is older than itſelf, becauſe מלך *muſt be before* המלך.

BUT if *Scaliger*, in making the reflexion abovementioned, had his eye principally on that ſpecies of purity in the Hebrew which conſiſts in the brevity of words, or in the paucity of ſyllables of which they are compoſed; Then it is to be obſerved, that although the Hebrew in this doth excel the *Syriac*, and other of the oriental Languages, yet this is no proof of it's primævity; for it is not to be compared in this reſpect with the old

*Runic*,

*Runic* or *Teutonic*, in which the words are moſtly monoſyllables. And this gave occaſion to *Goropius Becanus* to ſuppoſe the *Teutonic* or *Aſhkenazan* was the *mother* of all languages. Mr *Holloway* indeed makes very ſlight of this fancy too, and applies *Scaliger*'s *ſummam imperitiam* to it, as an abſurd notion like that of *Syriac* being more ancient than the Hebrew.

But with his leave, though there is no proof of the *Teutonic*, or any other of the barbarous languages having exiſtence before the Confuſion, yet, *ſo far as the plea goes*, from the ſimplicity and ſhortneſs of words, thoſe old languages which abound moſt in monoſyllables, have the beſt title to be thought the moſt ancient; at leaſt as ancient as the Hebrew can be *proved to be from this argument* of the paucity of of ſyallables in it's roots, being moſtly diſſyllables, though there are ſeveral monoſylables, and ſome biliterals among them. See what is ſaid of the *Chineſe* in this reſpect by Dr *Shuckford*, Connex. Vol. I. B. II.

It has been obſerved by ſeveral writers on the northern tongues, that there are numbers of Hebrew words in the Runic, Gothic,

Gothic, Saxon, Welſh, Engliſh, *&c.* To ſay that all theſe words came from the *Hebrew* or *Phenician*, becauſe they are found there alſo, is only begging the queſtion we are now upon; for why might they not be taken from the primæval language at the diviſion of tongues, and be retained in theſe northern languages as well as in the Hebrew? Nay why may not ſeveral other primitive words, or *Themata lingarum ſeptentrionalium* which have no affinity or connexion with the preſent Hebrew, or with any other of the oriental tongues, have nevertheleſs been originally taken from the firſt language of the earth at the diviſion of it? So that although Hebrew may well be allowed it's proportion of words taken from the primæval language, there is no reaſon, as far as hitherto appeareth, to exclude other languages from having their proportion too.

How far indeed the primæval words, which are yet retained in the Hebrew, or in any other tongue, may have changed or varied from the original ſignifications which they bore in the firſt language, is a queſtion impoſſible to be determined, ſave

ſave in the caſe of a few, whoſe primitive ſenſe is aſcertained by the Hebrew Scriptures as was obſerved in the laſt Section, where the alterations that are commonly made by time and uſage in all languages were conſidered. The only rule we have to go by, is to mark the ſignifications that the ſame words appear to have borne in different ages. For as Mr *Hutchinſon* well obſerves, (*Introd. to Moſes ſine Princ.* p. 17.) " *The meaning of every word muſt be taken* " *from the uſage in the time it was writ.*" He ſpeaks this of the Hebrew, though it is equally true of all other languages; and conſequently the writings of *Moſes* are to be interpreted according to the uſage of Hebrew words, ſo far as we can know it, in his time. עיר for inſtance muſt be underſtood of *a city*, it being evidently taken in *that* ſenſe in his days, and not in *the ſenſe, in which* Mr *Holloway thinks the Tabernacle or place of worſhip given to Adam after the Fall, muſt have been explained from the beginning*, &c. (Letter and Spir. *p.* 110, 111.) And ſeveral other words there are in the *Pentateuch*, which if their ſenſe be regulated by this rule of Mr *Hutchinſon*'s, will be found very little

little to correſpond with the radical or primary ſenſes given by Mr *Holloway* in his *originals*, or with the rectified ſenſes given by him in his *Letter and Spirit*, &c.

THERE can be no doubt but *Moſes* wrote in the language that was moſt familiar to, and was beſt underſtood by the *Iſraelites* when they came out of *Egypt*: And any words which he made uſe of as being then in uſe among them, whether properly Hebrew, or exotic, introduced into their language, comes within the denomination of biblical Hebrew. The exotic words indeed are ſaid to be comparatively few (ſee *Walton*'s Proleg.) though this perhaps is more than any man knows. However one would not on any ſlight pretence reject any Scripture word as not belonging to the Hebrew. When a noun for inſtance has no verbal root in the bible that we can diſcover, this doth not ſeem a ſufficient reaſon why we ſhould even ſuſpect that noun not to be pure Hebrew. And when we are told that becauſe אדון *Lord, hath no verb in the Hebrew, it is doubtful whether it be of that language* (Moſ. Princ. *p.* 66.) we are taught to be ſcrupulous, where, I think,

think, we need not be ſo. And we ſhall be obliged to ſpeak much more cautiouſly and diffidently of the purity and perfections of the Hebrew, if it be likewiſe doubtful of all other nouns which have no verb remaining in the language, as we now have it, whether they be of that language or not. Not only אדון, tho' one of the terms applied to God himſelf, but even אלוה and אלהים with the immutable ה, will be exotics by this rule: for they have no verb extant in the language as we now have it. Yet if theſe verbs be found in other dialects it may be preſumed they were once in the Hebrew too, or at leaſt that they were in the one original language which was diſtributed and ſorted at *Babel* into a variety of tongues, of which each carried ſome ſhare, though none, probably, carried the whole.

IT would ſeem unpardonable after what has been ſaid, not to make ſome apology to the author of the *Chriſtian Plan* for the liberties he will think have been taken with the ſacred tongue; by replying in a few words to his *demonſtration* of it's *ſupreme dignity and pre-eminence*, in the

the *Preface* to the *Chriſtian Plan*, p. 8, 9. Where after having obſerved that it is " The original underived language, always " ſubſiſting in the ſame beautiful and dura- " ble ſtate, wherein Providence hath pre- " ſerved it from it's firſt uſe in Paradiſe, " *&c.*——to it's preſent mode of exiſtence " in the Hebrew code,"——He adds—— " That it was uſed by God's people, more " or leſs during a courſe of 4000 years " and upwards, and by our Lord himſelf " even after his Aſcenſion——that it will " be" (he ſuppoſes) " the univerſal lan- " guage at the concluſion of the Chriſtian " ſyſtem or *Sæculum*——that it muſt " ſurvive the general conflagration."

As it pleaſed God to make uſe of this language himſelf when he ſpake the commandments, and to reveal his will in it to the Jews by *Moſes* and the prophets, in writing as well as in ſpeech, it is very truly ſaid by this learned Author to be *the language uſed by the Holy Ghoſt*, p. 8, and the *language of the Holy Ghoſt*, p. 9. And ſo it's claims to the epithet commonly given it of *ſacred* or *holy* are not diſputed. But I fear there is not a foundation for his inferences with reſpect either

to it's *primævity* or *diuturnity*. For with regard to the *former*, it can hardly be ſuppoſed that God ſhould at any time reveal his will to any nation in any other language than what they ſpoke. And though it were really a dialect ſprung from the diviſion at *Babel*, yet if it was the language of that people among whom he had choſen to promulge his law, it muſt be the language he would uſe with them.

When he more fully revealed his will by his own Son * who was the fulfiller of the whole Hebrew *law*, as well as the *Prophets*, he did it in the language ſpoken in Chriſt's time at *Jeruſalem*, and other parts of *Judæa*; commonly accounted *Syriac*, but ſuppoſed to be a mixed dialect that could neither boaſt purity nor antiquity †. Yet our Lord, we ſee, diſdained not to converſe in it during his life,

* To that part of the above-cited paſſage, where it is ſaid that *our Lord himſelf ſpoke* Hebrew *even after his Aſcenſion*, &c. I have already replied. *Review* P. I. p. 93.

† A Language, ſays Mr *Hutchinſon*, "upon which "the Holy Ghoſt hath put an indelible mark of infamy, "and preferred the Greek, a heathen language, to write "accounts of what was tranſacted and ſpoken in it."
——See his Works, Vol. ix. p. 4. in the notes.

life, and during the greateſt part of his life probably in the worſt or moſt uncouth dialect, or manner of pronouncing that language, viz. *the Galilæan*. He thought it not unworthy to be the vehicle of the moſt gracious meſſage that God ever ſent to mankind. So again, when the Holy Ghoſt revealed the Will of God to the Gentiles, he did it by means of all the languages then in uſe, wherever the Apoſtles preached. And when they, and the Evangeliſts, for the uſe of mankind in after-ages, opened *the door of Faith* to the whole world in writing, they did it in *Greek*; the language then moſt known and moſt extenſive; in which it ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt to diſplay the myſteries of the kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, which had been wrapped up, and had laid for the moſt part infolded in the Hebrew of the Old Teſtament.

As for what this learned writer ſays of *the peculiar excellence* of the Hebrew, to be *inferred from it's duration, ſince it muſt ſurvive the general conflagration, when all human writings will be conſumed*, p. 9. all the anſwer I have to give, is, that—ſince time alone can ſhew whether he be miſ-

taken in this or not, it will be the moſt prudent way to leave the deciſion of this point to the event.

I HAVE now ſpoken, I hope, largely enough, to the arguments uſed by my opponents, in reproof of *my Scepticiſm* in this matter; and have ſaid what may be ſufficient to vindicate the expreſſion which drew their animadverſions upon me. But far ſhort of what I think might be ſaid, and brought together on this extenſive and curious ſubject. They who would ſee it more compleatly diſcuſſed, may conſult Dr *Walton*'s third *Prolegomenon* to his Polyglott, with the ſeveral writers on both ſides of the queſtion, therein mentioned. Alſo *Huetius*'s arguments againſt the Primævity of the Hebrew in his *Demonſt. Evangel.* And *R. Simon*'s *Hiſtoire Critique du Vieux Teſtament* —— particularly, *Liv.* I. *chap.* 14. *De la langue Hebraïque, ſi elle eſt la premiere langue du monde*; and *Liv.* III. *chap.* 21. intituled, *Critique des Prolegomenes qui ſont au commencement de la Bible Polyglotte d'Angleterre*; with the ſeveral writers mentioned in thoſe chapters; to which I may add, a Diſſertation of *Le Clerc*, at the beginning of his Comment

ment on the *Pentateuch*. Among which authors will be found, (if I can make any judgment from what I have read in them) as much as can be pertinently ſaid upon the ſubject: And whoſoever reads them, or the principal of them, on each ſide of the queſtion, will ſoon be ſenſible of the deficiency of *the means of knowledge* neceſſary for determining upon it with any certainty; and that what is advanced by the aſſertors of the Primævity, is, and muſt be, in ſeveral reſpects, mere conjecture.

And it muſt always be remembered, that *certainty* and *conjecture* are different things: And though there be ſome who rather than own themſelves unknowing in any point, will chuſe to affim for *certain*, what can be no better than *gueſs-work*; yet every conſidering perſon will look upon conjectures, *as being what they are*; and will value them no higher than according to their eſtimate from their probability, and will regard nothing *as truth*, but what hath ſufficient evidence to ſupport it. So that, after all, it muſt be ſaid of thoſe who reſt weighty matters on their own opinions and ſurmiſes, on this de-

licate ſubject, which I have been ſpeaking to in part,——as Mr *Holloway* ſays, on another occaſion, of thoſe who endeavour to reduce the ancient Chronology by *Dynaſties*, into a conſiſtent ſcheme, viz. " *that ſo* " *many things are to be ſuppoſed in their ac-* " *counts, and ſo little probability of proof* " *at ſo great a diſtance, that the ſyſtems* " *which they raiſe are perfectly precarious.*" Letter and Spirit, &c. p. 468.

PROBABLY he will not own ſo much with reſpect to this ſubject of the primævity of the Hebrew tongue; but will repreſent *what* has been now ſaid, (and eſpecially what has been ſaid againſt his own manner of proving it) *as a vague way of talking*, and the *writer* thereof as having got once more *into the ambiguous vein.* (Vid. Remarks on Dr *Sharp*'s pieces, p. 14.) And will remind his reader, that there is nothing made ſo evident, but it may be contradicted, and diſputed by ſuch as are diſpoſed to be contentious.

A *vague way of talking* is what, I muſt confeſs, I would not willingly have imputed to me: becauſe it is always my endeavour to keep cloſe to my point, even where the point itſelf is *to prove the*

*the uncertainty of ſomething that is affirmed to be certain.* And, I muſt diſclaim all relation with that *fraternity of diſputers, who* (Mr *Holloway* ſays, Remarks, p. 15.) *are perpetually diſputing the things which nobody without the higheſt crime can diſpute.* And yet, at the ſame time, I conceive, that in all points, where *the truth* on one ſide is ſo apparent, as to leave the oppoſition to it from the other ſide in no better eſteem than as the mere effect of a ſpirit of contradiction, *no miſchief can be done*, in conſequence of ſuch diſpute, *among reaſonable people:* although it muſt be owned, that ſuch a ſpirit of contradiction, when ſhewn upon ſome ſubjects, (very different from theſe, on acconnt of which Mr *Holloway* makes his complaint) is a high crime: and that a fraternity of diſputers, who diſpute every thing, is a ſet of people as odious as they are criminal. But there are other diſputes, as Mr *Holloway* muſt very well know, in which it is leſs evident on which ſide the truth lies; and which are ſupported with ſo promiſing an appearance of it by each of the contending parties, as ſhall render a fair and underſtanding man dubious on which ſide of

the queſtion it appears with moſt advantage. And, I can ſee no harm in ſuſpending one's aſſent, or even talking *in the ambiguous* vein upon thoſe points, till ſomething can be thrown into *one* ſcale of probability, that ſhall make it greatly preponderate againſt *the other*.

And as I cannot but think the primævity of the Hebrew, in the ſenſe it is aſſerted by my opponents to convict me of Scepticiſm, is a ſubject of this *properly diſputable kind*, of which much may be ſaid, and not improbably or impertinently ſaid *in utramque partem*; it is, I conceive, no ways blameable to forbear giving ſentence either way, until ſuch primævity can be made out, I do not ſay, by undeniable proofs, but, by ſuch reaſonable teſtimonies as may give ſatisfaction to all ſenſible and competent judges. And till this is done, there ſeems no great cauſe for the exclamation of ωοιον επος, &c. (Vide Mr *Holloway*'s Remarks, p. 15.) againſt any one who ſhall expreſs his doubt concerning this ſuppoſed diſtinguiſhing prerogative of the Hebrew language.

In a word, I ſhall, for my own part, readily embrace every fair and juſt argument that can be brought in proof of the primævity, or any other peculiar excellence, or ſingular pre-eminence of the Hebrew tongue. And, in the mean time, I do not in the leaſt ſcruple to ſay, what *R. Simon* ſaid of it in compariſon with the *Chaldee*, and ſome other languages, which he mentions, —— that *if it be true* that *Adam* ſpoke *any one* of the languages now known in the world, *Il aura ſans doute parlè Hebreu.* Or, *if it be true*, as *Grotius* imagined, *primam linguam nullibi extare, ſed in Confuſione periiſſe, ejus tamen relliquias in omnibus linguis extare*; that then the Hebrew, as we now have it in the Holy Scriptures, is more conformable to what we may reaſonably ſuppoſe the primitive language to have been, in reſpect of it's ſimplicity, and hath ſuffered leſs diminution of the original purity of language than any dialect, into which the firſt language was broken, ſo far as any judgment can be formed of thoſe other dialects at this diſtance of time.

AND whoſoever thinks he can go further than this, will do well to be ſure of of the grounds on which he proceeds.

[*End of the firſt Diſcourſe.*]

DISCOURSE

# DISCOURSE II.

## SECT. I.

*Some account of the correſpondence between Dr* Chandler, *late Biſhop of* Durham, *and Mr* Holloway, *upon the primævity, and pre-eminence of the Hebrew; with a reply to Mr* Holloway's *late treatiſe on that ſubject, ſo far as it concerns his Lordſhip.*

MR *HOLLOWAY* having already given *ſome account* of the correſpondence he had, above ten years before, with the late learned and judicious Prelate, Dr *Edward Chandler*, on the ſubject of the Primævity, &c. And having been therein much more ſparing, in laying before the Public the part his Lordſhip took in the correſpondence, than in repreſenting the ſhare he bore in it himſelf;

ſelf; I ſhall make no apology, for I apprehend I need none, for endeavouring to ſupply what he hath left deficient on his Lordſhip's ſide of the queſtion. Indeed, it is more peculiarly incumbent on me to vindicate his Lordſhip on this occaſion, as I had the favour of being entruſted by him with ſome intelligence of this correſpondence while it was on foot; and as I am now, I believe, the only perſon that hath any of the neceſſary materials for explaining the ſhare his Lordſhip was pleaſed to take in it.

How many letters his Lordſhip wrote to Mr *Holloway* on this ſubject, and on this occaſion, I know not. I have only the copies of two, which are luckily, as it proves, preſerved; one of them in his ſecretary's hand-writing, but ſigned and dated by himſelf, the date whereof is *December* 1, 1743. And that Mr *Holloway* received it, appears by his quotation from it in p. 5.

The other, indeed, is neither dated, nor ſigned, or even concluded in form, yet it is wrote in his Lordſhip's own hand, and is in anſwer, ſo far as it goes, to a letter from Mr *Holloway*, of four ſheets of paper.

paper. I do not aver that Mr *Holloway* received this letter, or part of an anſwer, becauſe I cannot prove it: neither am I certain that the writing now before me is exactly conformable to that which is (as I ſuppoſe) in Mr *Holloway*'s poſſeſſion; becauſe I cannot be ſure whether it may not be the firſt draught from whence the letter itſelf was written, perhaps with amendments, or alterations. Yet I have *little* reaſon to doubt that Mr *Holloway* received it, or one to the ſame effect, from what I obſerve in his ſubſequent letters; and have *no* reaſon to think that what I call *the copy*, whether in ſtrictneſs *ſuch* or not, was any ways different in ſubſtance from the original letter, which I preſume was ſent.

THAT his Lordſhip wrote one or more letters beſides theſe two abovementioned, appears from what Mr *Holloway* ſays, at p. 49, about the derivation of *mylitta*; and at p. 53. where a paſſage is quoted from his Lordſhip, concerning the names of the heathen deities, &c. neither of which points are handled in the copies abovementioned. But I muſt make uſe of ſuch materials as I have, and I judge they

are

are not ſo ſcanty, but they may ſerve to very good purpoſe: for his Lordſhip's ſentiments upon the whole queſtion, are plainly and diſtinctly laid down in them, as will preſently appear.

I AM very ſenſible that private correſpondences ought not, without good reaſon, to be divulged: and at no time to be further divulged than there is an apparent cauſe for it, in order to vindicate the characters of either of the correſpondents from public miſrepreſentations. And, I am apt to believe, that his Lordſhip in civility to Mr *Holloway*, would never have mentioned him by name, what occaſion ſoever he might have to communicate in part, what had paſſed between them in this private epiſtolary way.

INDEED, ſo tender was his Lordſhip of his correſpondent, that although he early acquainted me with the ſubſtance of this ſhort and amicable controverſy, yet he never told me who the perſon was with whom he held it, nor could I learn it till ſome time after his Lordſhip's death. And after I knew it, and had alſo poſſeſſion of Mr *Holloway*'s own letters, (with ſome few remarks of his Lordſhip's interlined in

ſhort-

ſhort-hand) I never communicated them, or any part of them, as they were wrote in confidence, to any perſon whatſoever, nor even once mentioned the name of Mr *Holloway*, as having been concerned in a correſpondence with his Lordſhip on this queſtion, 'till he thought fit to report it himſelf in print. Neither ſhall I now take notice of any particulars in Mr *Holloway*'s letters, (that he may not ſay, I uſe him ungenerouſly or unkindly) but ſuch as his late treatiſe on the *Primævity* obliges me to ſpeak to, in defence of my honoured Lord and Patron, and much eſteemed friend.

SECT.

## SECT. II.

'MY *reaſon* (ſays Mr *Holloway*, p. 4.) 'for making uſe of ſome parts of 'this correſpondence is, that the Biſhop pro- 'poſed his objections, though in brief, yet 'with intimations of better reaſons leading 'to fuller, and more exact anſwers than any 'I have ſeen. Which therefore it may be 'ſo much more conducive to the public utility 'to have diſcuſſed.'

THAT is, if I rightly underſtand Mr *Holloway*'s meaning,—his Lordſhip gave intimations of better reaſons than he was able to give, or at leaſt than he cared to give; and that therefore it would be of uſe to have his objections produced publickly, that thoſe better reaſons to which they lead, if by this means they might be elicited, may be thoroughly diſcuſſed, proved, or diſproved.

BUT they who well knew his Lordſhip's communicative diſpoſitions, as well as

as his great abilities, will look upon this ſuggeſtion, ſo far as it can be ſuppoſed to concern his Lordſhip, as coming from a perſon who was abſolutely a ſtranger to him. And, ſo indeed, Mr *Holloway* was. It ſhould alſo be remembered, that at the time when this correſpondence was on foot, his Lordſhip was advanced in years, and had in good meaſure (as he told Mr *Holloway* in his firſt letter) *diſuſed theſe ſtudies*. But what was more, he was alſo extreamly debilitated with frequent and grievous pains, from a diſtemper which was then become irremediable. He acquainted Mr *Holloway* in the ſame letter, (viz. of *December* 1, 1743.) that " *ſince* " *the acceſs of the winter, his diſorders had* " *been ſo encreaſed as to render him uſeleſs in* " *life, and unfit for application, to ſtudy, or* " *buſineſs.*" And in the other letter he has theſe words. " *I am at times in inexpreſ-* " *ſible miſery; I cannot continue above half* " *an hour in any poſture, nor keep my diſtrac-* " *ted thoughts long intent upon any point.* " *But leaſt you ſhould think I diſapprove of* " *your deſign, which, as far as I know it,* " *I do not; I ſend you a few thoughts in the*

" *few intervals of eaſe, with which Provi-*
" *dence indulges me.*'

YET notwithſtanding theſe diſadvantages and difficulties he laboured under, what he wrote was ſo *maſterly*, (as Mr *Holloway* confeſſes in one inſtance, at p. 53.) and withal, in ſo candid and condeſcending a manner, as to deſerve (what, indeed, he received from Mr *Holloway* in ſeveral letters) very grateful acknowledgements.

IT is no wonder his Lordſhip's objections *were propoſed in brief*, conſidering the circumſtances he was then under, as deſcribed above by himſelf. But what was thus *brief*, was nevertheleſs *cloſe*, *ſtrong*, and *clear*. And though he *intimated more* than he expreſſed, yet he might think ſuch intimation alone ſufficient for a perſon ſo learned, ſo inquiſitive, and ſo induſtrious as he took Mr *Holloway* to be; without deſcending to a detail of thoſe particulars which Mr *Holloway* ſeems now to account *deſiderata* in his Lordſhip's letters.

" *THE learned Biſhop*, (ſays he, p. 4.)
" *in one of his letters to me, ſpeaking of the*
" *ſuperlative excellence I had aſcribed to the*
" *Hebrew*

" *Hebrew language ſaid*, he thought this " language had no preference to other " languages."

To underſtand this the better, I ſhould take notice, that Mr *Holloway* had ſent his Lordſhip a little printed plan, of four pages in 12mo, giving an account of the deſign of his *Originals* and *Annotations* on the Scriptures, neither of which were then publiſhed. And this was the occaſion of the ſhort correſpondence between them. In this plan, one part of the deſign was laid down in theſe words——" *to exem-* " *plify the perfection, certainty, and expreſ-* " *ſiveneſs of the Hebrew language.*" To which his Lordſhip ſaid, " *I ſhall be pleaſed* " *to ſee the Hebrew tongue proved to be per-* " *fect, certain, and clear, to the degree you* " *ſuggeſt, having hitherto thought it had in* " *no reſpect a preference to other languages.*" And whereas, another part of the deſign, as is ſet forth in the ſaid plan, was—— " *To prove that one needs but trace the* " *words, or names of things, natural or di-* " *vine, to their firſt roots in this language,* " *to come at the ideal deſcription of each,* " viz. *of the cauſe, operation, condition,* " *relation, production, or the manner of act-*

" *ing, or being acted upon, that does di-*
" *ſtinguiſh it from every other thing.*"——
His Lordſhip replied to this, in the ſame letter, as follows,

" *YOU aſſert that this perfection and*
" *certainty may be proved from the roots*
" *truly inveſtigated, and that the Hebrew*
" *words contain ſuch an ideal deſcription of*
" *the thing, as doth diſtinguiſh it from every*
" *other thing.*

" *OF this I would willingly have ſeen*
" *ſome examples.*

" *THE names of things have been thought,*
" *in general, to be taken from ſome obvious*
" *quality, attribute, action, paſſion, &c. re-*
" *markable in the things on which they were*
" *impoſed. But* ſeldom *are theſe qualities,*
" *&c. ſo* peculiar *as to diſtinguiſh them*
" *from other things that partake of the ſame*
" *qualities, but by uſage: and* very ſeldom
" *do they paint in the mind a more compleat*
" *idea of the object, than what the mere*
" *ſound of the word would give, if the name*
" *had been impoſed arbitrarily.*"

THIS objection was *propoſed*, indeed, *in brief*, and only gave *intimations of reaſons leading to fuller and more exact anſwers*; and yet it is ſo pertinent and weighty, as

not

not be removed, or ſet aſide, ſo far as I can judge, by any thing ſaid by Mr *Holloway* in his reply to it; wherein he ſet forth, and exemplified his method of inveſtigating *Hebrew Themata*. Of which method, as deſcribed in his letter, I ſhall take no notice. His originals, ſince publiſhed, are an ample and undoubted ſpecimen of his ſucceſs in this ſcheme. And I leave it to the world, in whoſe hands that work now is, to judge whether he hath, in thoſe two laboured volumes of his Originals, which gave him ſcope enough to prove his ſkill in this way, got over that *one ſhort objection* to his plan that his Lordſhip made in the paſſage juſt now recited.

ANOTHER prerogative of the Hebrew tongue, mentioned in the aforeſaid plan was —— "*That all neceſſary revelations of* "*things, philoſophical or religious, were gi-* "*ven in this language to believers.*"

TO which, his Lordſhip made anſwer, ——That the Hebrew could "*claim no* "*privilege from God's communicating his* "*revelation to the* Jews *in that tongue, but* "*what muſt be aſcribed to the* Chaldee, *and* "Greek *tongues, on the ſame account. For*

" *God* (as he adds) *ſpeaks to men* in the " language of men; *in the* Hebrew, *while* " *that was the mother tougue of the* Jews; " *in* Greek, *when the* Gentiles *were to re-* " *ceive his Law*; *and he would ſpeak in* " Chineſe *or* Engliſh, *was he pleaſed to com-* " *municate his Will to the nations that ſpoke* " *theſe languages.*"

THIS obſervation was well worthy Mr *Holloway*'s conſidering, though I do not know that he hath any where endeavoured to take off the force of it, otherwiſe than by abounding in *encomiums* on the pre-eminence of the Hebrew, as being, in a peculiar ſenſe, *the language of God*, even though it were not the language infuſed into *Adam* at the Creation. See *Primævity*, &c. p. 10.

I SHALL only add one paſſage more out of this firſt letter of December 1, 1743, with which his Lordſhip concludes it.

" *I CANNOT promiſe, beforehand,* " *to be your diſciple in ſome ſentiments you* " *may advance. But, while you keep within* " *the bounds of* modeſty, *and* moderation, " *and offer your thoughts* without dogma- " ticalneſs, or contempt *of thoſe that differ* " *from you, I think every ſcholar muſt*

" *favour*

" *favour your attempt to cut away through*
" *untrodden paths; and I truſt you will, in*
" *the end, receive the due fruits of your*
" *honeſt well intended labours.*"

I MAKE as little doubt of *this Gentleman's honeſt and good intentions*, as his Lordſhip did: and I wiſh as good effects from them upon himſelf, as his Lordſhip could. But I ſhould be glad, at the ſame time, to ſee him keep within thoſe bounds, which his Lordſhip kindly, and diſcreetly adviſed him not to tranſgreſs. Had he attended to this counſel, not only ſome expreſſions in his writings, but ſome whole periods had not been found there. To look at preſent no further than this little piece on the Primævity, and in that part of it only, which relates to his correſpondence with his Lordſhip——He could ſcarce have ſaid, immediately after he had recited his anſwer to his Lordſhip ——'*Now to be a little more particular,*
" *on ſome of the proofs above given, of the*
" *primævity of the Hebrew language (tho'*
" *it be* το φως ηλιω δανειζειν) *I will go back,*
" *and recollect, and enlarge upon ſome of*
" *them.*" p. 11. Neither would he have ſaid, on ſumming up his enlarged proofs,

" *All this, I ſay, is proof, (as I have al-*
" *ready made it ſufficiently appear) of the*
" *primævity, and pre-eminence of this tongue,*
" *SO VAST and COGENT, that*
" *none like it is to be had of any other re-*
" *mote hiſtorical fact in the world.*" p. 55.

THESE kind of expreſſions are only fit to be uſed to thoſe who are, or who *promiſe beforehand* to be his *diſciples in whatever ſentiments he may advance.* For it is with ſuch pre-aſſenting perſons only, that they can in the leaſt help out, or cover any deficiency in an argument.

BUT to return——Mr *Holloway* takes no other notice of this candid and prudent letter he had received from his Lordſhip, out of which the paſſages above are recited, than to tell the world, that his Lordſhip, *in one of his letters to him*, had ſaid——" *He thought that this language had*
" *no preference to other languages—that he*
" *took it for one of the ſeveral tongues that*
" *were formed in different places and times,*
" *out of the* Noachick *language; that it*
" *was not derived down by* Sem's *line, but*
" Cham's, &c."

" *TO which*, (ſays Mr *Holloway*) *I re-*
" *turned—That I took his Lordſhip to men-*

" *tion*

" *tion this only as a thought, which he had*
" *ſometimes entertained* in tranſitu, *but*
" *which had never been formed into any ſet-*
" *tled opinion, or judgment; and carried on*
" *my reaſonings to the contrary, in the fol-*
" *lowing manner.*"—*Primævity.* p. 5.

BOTH his Lordſhip's words and Mr *Holloway*'s are truly cited, from their reſpective letters. Yet his Lordſhip is left, after this recital, to be conſidered by the reader, as one who had taken a very ſlight and ſuperficial view of the matter, and who, after having received a gentle reproof for doing ſo, had yielded up the unſettled notions he had ſometimes entertained, to the vaſt and cogent force of thoſe ſolid arguments, whereby he was overcome. While the reaſonings themſelves are repreſented to have been ſo ſucceſsfully carried on by Mr *Holloway*, without any reply, in appearance, offered to them, that they ought now at length, as they had ſo happy an effect upon his Lordſhip, to be publiſhed for the conviction of all men.

HERE it is, that the other copy, which I have in my Lord's own writing, comes ſeaſonably in aid to his former letter.

" *YOUR*

" *YOUR next aſſertion*, (ſays his Lord-
" ſhip) *that the preſent* Hebrew *tongue was*
" *the ſame that* Adam *ſpoke, and his poſte-*
" *rity to the Flood, the ſame that* Noah *and*
" *his children ſpoke to the diſperſion at* Ba-
" bel, *and the ſame that was continued in*
" *the line of the Patriarchs to* Abraham,
" *is, indeed, very oppoſite to my ſentiments:*
" *which were not taken up* in tranſitu, *but*
" *on ſome conſideration of theſe things as far*
" *as we have* data. *But of* data *we have*
" *too few to form any other opinion than*
" *what is conjectural. And though I would*
" *have mine [illegible] for ſuch, you ſhould not,*
" *on the other hand, be too certain of your's,*
" *which I think is overturned by thoſe ar-*
" *guments you uſe in defence of it.*"

THE arguments to which his Lordſhip refers, are thoſe made uſe of in Mr *Holloway*'s letter abovementioned. In which having ſaid, as is before recited, that he took his Lordſhip's notion, about the Hebrew being derived down by *Cham*'s line, &c. to be a curſory reflexion, which had never been formed by his Lordſhip into a ſettled opinion: he adds this reaſon for ſaying ſo, viz.——

" *FOR*

" *FOR though the* Canaanites, *ſome of*
" *the deſcendants of* Cham, *(who were*
" *planted in the country where the Father of*
" *the Faithful was by the Divine Provi-*
" *dence to be ſettled) were permitted to re-*
" *tain this language, after the other hea-*
" *thens had either loſt, or much mixed and*
" *confounded it; yet was it not one of the*
" *many* ramenta *of the old* Noachic *lan-*
" *guage; but was that very language itſelf,*
" *delivered down from* Heber *to* Abraham,
" *and continued down in his line to the* Ba-
" byloniſh Captivity."

WHO would not have taken this, (as it ſeems his Lordſhip did) for a *conceſſion* that the language of the old *Canaanites* was *Hebrew?* yet, when this reaſoning is repeated, (*Primævity*, p. 5.) it turns out no more than a *ſuppoſition*, or a caſe put on purpoſe to ſhew that it may not be admitted.——" *For ſuppoſing, but not grant-*
" *ing what ſome learned men have before*
" *ſuppoſed, that the* Canaanites, *&c.*——
" *were permitted to retain this language,*
" &c.——*Yet was it neither the* Canaanites
" peculium, *nor one of the many* ramenta
" *of the* Noachick *language, but that*
" very

" very language itſelf, *handed down from* " Heber."

BUT he does not ſeem to have attended to the conſequences of *ſuppoſing this*; for it follows from his own manner of putting the caſe, and notwithſtanding his *caveat* againſt Hebrew being thought the *Canaanites Peculium*, that it was derived down by *Cham*'s line as well as by *Sem*'s; which yet he will not care to allow. Nay, the ſuppoſing the *Canaanites* to RETAIN the *Noachic* language may have further conſequences, at which his Lordſhip points in the concluſion of his Reply to Mr *Holloway*'s argument from the Hebrew names of perſons and places, before the tranſaction at *Babel*.

" *BUT if there be any force in this* " *argument*, (ſays his Lordſhip) *it goes too* " *far, and proves that either* there *was no* " *confuſion of languages at* Babel, *or that* " *the poſterity of* Cham retained *the* Noa- " chical *language, while thoſe of* Sem's *line* " *ſpoke a different tongue.*"

THIS *alternative*, of either no confuſion of language at *Babel*, or of *Ham*'s poſterity eſcaping it, while thoſe of *Sem*'s line were affected by it, ſeems to have given

given Mr *Holloway* a good deal of thought and trouble. He had once been in Mr *Hutchinſon*'s ſentiment, that there was no confuſion of language at *Babel*. Yet in his *Letter and Spirit* he gives good reaſons for his departing from Mr *Hutchinſon* in this point, and allows a confuſion of language at *Babel*; but he limits it to the line of *Ham*, *the apoſtate world*, denoted, as he ſuppoſes, by the phraſe of the *whole earth*: (*Letter and Spirit*, p. 109. 115.) Whoſe language being thus confounded, the line of *Sem* will ſeem to be left in poſſeſſion of the *Noachic* language, and the progeny of *Ham* to have utterly loſt it. By which means Mr *Holloway* appeared to be provided with a defence againſt the other part of his Lordſhip's alternative, having thus found an expedient for reconciling, what before ſeemed incompatible: and being able to ſhew the conſiſtency of a confuſion of the *Noachic* language with it's being derived down by *Sem*'s line not by *Cham*'s.

BUT this conſtruction of *whole earth*, Gen. xi. 1. being ſingular and extraordinary, and the reſtriction of the confuſion of language to *Ham*'s curſed progeny, ſtanding

ſtanding very ill with the proofs that are brought of Hebrew (his *Noachic* language) being the language of old *Canaan*, he doth not think fit to inſiſt upon it in his late piece, concerning the *primævity*, &c. If I miſtake not, he doth not once mention it there, but returns to his former reaſoning with his Lordſhip, now ſomething improved.

He will *ſuppoſe* for argument's ſake, but will not *grant* that the *Canaanites* retained the *Noachic* language, or ſpoke *Hebrew*. And even *on ſuppoſition* that they did *retain* it, yet, as he now adds, *it was not their Peculium*.

Yes, ſurely it was, if they alone had it as their native tongue. For in what ſenſe can any language be the *Peculium*, or property of any race or community of men, in which *Hebrew* was not *theirs*? We have all the evidence of it's being the common language of their country that can be expected, or are uſually required in ſuch a caſe. The proper names of perſons and places, in great abundance, *ſtrictly Hebrew*. Names much more in number, and much more retentive of the Hebrew propriety, than any Mr *Holloway* gives

gives from the ſame topic, in proof of Hebrew being retained in *Sem*'s line.

He doth not ſay, or make any attempt to ſhew, that the *Canaanites* had another language beſides the Hebrew, which was their *peculium*, or mother tongue? This might, indeed, have been the caſe of *Abraham*, and his progenitors, whilſt they dwelt in *Ur*, of the *Chaldees*, and in *Meſopotamia*; provided they really retained (that I may alſo ſuppoſe, without granting) the Hebrew, together with the languages of thoſe countries. For, as Mr *Holloway* obſerves, *p.* 32. They "*Living* "*among the* Aramites, *the deſcendants of* "*one of the ſons of* Shem, *all of them knew*, "*and on ſome occaſions, as early as the time* "*of* Laban, *made uſe of the* Aramitiſh, *or* "Chaldee *tongue*." But there is no room to think this was the caſe of the *Canaanites*, or that they had any other dialect beſides the Hebrew, which was their vernacular tongue.

But if it was neither (as he now tells us) the *Canaanites peculium*, nor one of the many *ramenta* of the *Noachic* language, What was it then?——Why it was the *very* Noachic "*Language handed down* "*from*

" *from* Heber, *together with the true Faith*
" *of* Noah, *and the* antediluvian Patriarchs,
" *to* Abraham, *and in his race was pre-*
" *ſerved to the* Babyloniſh Captivity; *whilſt*
" *among the remains of the* Canaanites, *af-*
" *ter the days of* Joſhua, *it was ſoon loſt,*
" *degenerating into what was afterwards*
" *called, the* Aramitiſh *and the* Phenician."
*Primævity*, &c. p. 5.

THAT is, according to the faireſt conſtruction I can put upon this intricate paragraph——Although the *Canaanites* be *ſuppoſed* to have retained the *Noachic* language as well as the line of *Heber*, yet they retained not the primitive Faith. Which Faith went along with the primitive language in *Heber*'s line, but did not accompany it among the *Canaanites*.—— However, they might preſerve the language (though without the Faith) for *Abraham*'s ſake: and when the end of their retaining it was anſwered to him and his ſeed, they loſt it, or at leaſt they loſt it's purity.

NOW ſuppoſing this, if I have repreſented it as it was intended, to have been the caſe, yet it was the *Canaanites peculium*, properly ſpeaking, though in an

an extraordinary providential way. And, what is more, it was upon this ſuppoſition derived down in *Ham*'s line in a moſt remarkable manner. Therefore Mr *Holloway*'s inference is wrong in *p.* 7. where ſpeaking of proper names in *Nahor*'s family being *pure Hebrew*, he immediately adds, " *And* SO *not the* Canaanites *pro-* " *perty*;" whereas in truth Hebrew, as a language, was as much their property as *Nahor*'s, and in ſome reſpects more ſo.

BUT this is enough to have remarked upon it as *a ſuppoſition*, and not a *conceſſion*, eſpecially as I have conſidered the point more fully in the preceding diſcourſe, and ſhewn that it hath no conſequence, whether conceded, or ſuppoſed, towards proving the Biblical Hebrew to have been the language of *Adam* in Paradiſe, which is Mr *Holloway*'s drift —— " *From* Adam " *to* Noah, *and from* Noah *to the affair* " *at* Babel, *and from thence to the times of* " Jacob, *and his family*,——*the language* " *of* Adam, *and the antediluvian Patri-* " *archs*,—*of* Noah, Shem, *and* Heber,— " *of* Abraham, *and of* Nahor; *within the* " *land of* Canaan, *and out of it*,—*in* Ur " *of the* Chaldees, *and in* Padan-Aram,

" *was one and the ſame language, the* Bibli-
" cal Hebrew." *Primævity, p.* 7.

No conſideration is had in all this account of the language of old *Canaan*, notwithſtanding his Lordſhip had advertiſed him, that

" *ALL our evidence is to be fetched*
" *from* Moſes; *and his writings evidently*
" *ſhew, that the ſame Hebrew names of*
" *perſons and places were commonly received*
" *in all that tract of land, from* Euphra-
" tes *to the* Mediterranean, *(which was*
" *promiſed to* Abraham's *ſeed) long before*
" Abraham *ſet his foot there.*"—And that
" *From ſo many inſtances of Hebrew words,*
" *much more numerous than thoſe in the ge-*
" *nealogy from* Sem *to* Abraham, *it follows*
" *that the Hebrew tongue was the tongue of*
" *of the* Canaanites, *long before* Abraham
" *ſettled in* Canaan; *and conſequently, it was*
" *the language of the people which firſt inha-*
" *bited this country, after the affair of* Ba-
" bel." And——" *They were* Cham *and*
" *his Children.*"

To all this Mr *Holloway* pays little regard, and proceeds. " *There was no break,*
" *no chaſm, nor change of language among*

" *the*

" *the perſons, and in the countries abovemen-*
" *tioned.*" Primævity, *p.* 8.

THIS would have come very unaccountably from one who acknowledges the *Noachic* language to have been confounded at *Babel*, if he had not reſtrained what he ſays to *perſons* and *countries*, excluſive of the *Canaanites*, and limited the confuſion of tongues to the curſed progeny of *Ham*. But, notwithſtanding the caution uſed in wording this ſentence, he afterwards confeſſes, viz. in *p.* 32. the uſe of *two dialects*, among *the perſons*, and in *the countries* he had mentioned: which though it be neither *break*, *chaſm*, nor *change*, of the Hebrew language, yet makes leſs for it's univerſality, and immutability, than the *ſole uſe* of it would have done. But to the *ſole uſe* of it, none but the *Canaanites*, as far as we can gather, could make pretence. By his limitation, indeed, of the confuſion of language to *Ham*'s poſterity, there was *a break*, and *a change* in it, moſt notorious. But let this obſervation be taken along with it, that if the ſpeaking Hebrew (which the *Canaanites* did) be conſiſtent with ſuch *a break*, and *change* of language in the line

of *Ham*, as Mr *Holloway* hath admitted; then the Hebrew being alſo the language of one family in the line of *Shem*, is no proof that there had been *no break*, *chaſm*, or *change*, in the language of *Abraham*'s progenitors. —— " *Not a word*, (as Mr " *Holloway* proceeds, ibid.) *of another ſtamp* " *thruſt in*, *(except only one monumental* " *name recorded in* Geneſis) *for the ſpace of* " 2265 *years*, from the Creation."

How many words of other ſtamps were thruſt in, at, and after the confuſion of language, nobody can ſay. But that *none were thruſt in*, is more than he, or any perſon, can without great preſumption affirm. *Moſes* happens to mention in one place, two *Syriac* words of *Laban*'s, ſpoken, as it ſhould ſeem, in the language of his country. But, becauſe he was of *Nahor*'s family, in which Mr *Holloway* ſuppoſes Hebrew to have been ſpoken, therefore theſe two *Syriac* words, ſignifying *the heap of witneſs*, are now repreſented as *thruſt in* under the notion of *a monumental name*. Whereas, it is very obvious, that what *Jacob* expreſſed in proper *Hebrew*, was by *Laban* expreſſed in proper *Syriac*; which is a proof that the latter was *Laban*'s native

native language, as Hebrew was *Jacob*'s. And, I think, Mr *Holloway* owned as much, during the correſpondence, when he ſaid in the abovementioned letter to his Lordſhip, concerning this very paſſage, as follows,

"JACOB *called the* heap of witneſs "*raiſed by him and* Laban גל עד *in ſim-* "*ple Hebrew*; *and* Laban *called the ſame* "*in the derived* Aramitiſh *or* Chaldee "יגר שהדותא. *The Sacred Penman gives* "*us not the* Hebrew name *only*, *but the* "Aramitiſh *alſo with it*."

AND although there is no inſtance of *Nahor*'s family uſing the *Syriac* earliar than this; yet as they lived among the *Aramites*, the preſumption will lie, that they talked that language moſtly. And, if they did, his Lordſhip's opinion will prove juſt and right, viz. that *Sem*'s line ſpoke a different tongue from that of the *Canaanites*. And that, however, the knowledge of the Hebrew might be preſerved in one family for ſacred uſes, (which is the moſt that any of Mr *Holloway*'s arguments extend to) yet *Syriac* was the *peculium* of *Sem*'s line, as Hebrew was of *Cham*'s.

I NOW proceed to Mr *Holloway*'s proofs of the primævity of the Hebrew, which lie together in *p.* 6. of his late piece, and which he ſays "*Are commonly known, and* "*generally allowed.*" And if he had annexed to them his Lordſhip's anſwer, (even ſo far as it goes in the copy before me) it would neither have given him much trouble, nor taken up much room: becauſe his Lordſhip's reaſonings lie in a little compaſs.

BUT, I ſhall ſupply the defect as far as I am able.

"*HERE are three ſteps,* (ſays my "Lord) *by which you proceed to your con-* "*cluſion.*

"1. *FROM* Adam *to the Flood, the* "*names of all the perſons deſcended from him* "*are* Hebrew.

"*BUT, pray, Sir, how few are they?* "*too few to build a general obſervation up-* "*on. Above a hundred more pure He-* "*brew words are to be found in ſome,* "*and many of them in moſt of the ancient* "*languages, and yet thoſe languages are all* "*different from each other.*"

THE brevity of this reply may make it ſeem to Mr *Holloway* rather an *intima-*

*tion*

*tion* than an *anſwer*. But yet, I think, the inference from what his Lordſhip obſerves, is not only obvious enough, but alſo unfriendly enough to Mr *Holloway*'s hypotheſis. For the inference is this. That the Hebrew may have ſeveral words from the one primitive tongue, and yet be a different language. Or, that the having ſeveral words in common, is no proof that languages are therefore the ſame. Why might not the Hebrew, and the other tongues, which have many of the ſame roots, derive them from a language which was neither Hebrew nor any other language now extant? And how many other words may there be in other languages, which were derived originally from the *one language* of the earth, which yet do not appear in the Hebrew?

2. ANOTHER of Mr *Holloway*'s arguments of the ſame nature is, that from the Flood, down to the affair at *Babel*, the proper names of perſons and places are Hebrew.

"*THESE names*, (replied my Lord) "*are alſo too few to infer any thing from* "*them with certainty. They only prove, that*

" *in a general ſhipwreck, ſome languages re-*
" *tained more of the diſjointed planks than*
" *others did.*"

I WAS ſo unfortunate as to give Mr *Holloway* great offence, by uſing a like expreſſion in my *Diſſertations*.

HE " *Wiſhed*, (ſee his third particu-
" lar Remark) *that ſuch ſlighting things*
" *of the Hebrew, the language given to*
" Adam *by God, had not fallen from ſuch*
" *a pen. He ſhould think a Chriſtian in*
" *theſe days of learning, could never call*
" *this point in queſtion: but Dr* Sharp
" *would repreſent it as dubious.*"

I CAN the more eaſily bear with any of his cenſures on myſelf, ſince he could ſo eaſily ſuppreſs his offence at the ſame things, when they fell from the much more able pen of one of the moſt learned writers in this age of learning.

HIS Lordſhip's notions on this ſubject were, ſo far as I knew them, the ſame with my own. And I had ſome extraordinary opportunities of knowing them; and am very ſure they were not taken up curſorily, or *in tranſitu*, but formed upon a variety of obſervations, on the nature and changes of languages, and a cloſe attention

tention to the relation which the oriental bore to each other, as well as their affinity in a more remote degree with all the ancient languages. This was a ſtudy, in which he had formerly taken great delight, and of this kind of knowledge he was a great maſter.

THIS ſecond proof from the Hebrew names of perſons and places, before the Diſperſion, which his Lordſhip thought too ſlender to infer any thing *certainly* from, appeared nevertheleſs to Mr *Holloway* ſo very ſtrong, that after having ſpoke of his own deductions in general, in theſe words, *p.* 8.— "*This identity of language,* "*as deduced above, being too apparent to be* "*denied by any body, could never, with any* "*ſhew of argument, be oppoſed by any.*" He adds, with reſpect to *this particular proof*, as follows,

"*NOTHING therefore remained for* "*the oppoſers of this plain truth, but to ſlur* "*in an evaſion, to ſupply the place of an* "*objection, which, however, (beſides other* "*marks of falſity) carries along with it the* "*ſelf-detection that all evaſions do*, viz. *that* "*of being uttered abſolutely, (as we ſay)* "*without book, or by mere gueſs, and there-*

"*fore*

" *fore, in reality, deſerves nobody's notice.*
" *The evaſion I mean is, that though the*
" *Ante-babylonian proper names* are *all of*
" *the Hebrew original and idiom,* yet,"—
then follows the evaſion, printed as a quotation——" *There was, or* MIGHT *be,*
" *ſome other primitive language, out of which*
" Moſes *afterwards tranſlated them into* his
" Hebrew, *to make all conformable to the*
" *language in which he wrote.*"

Now the reader is deſired to take notice, that this evaſion was not his Lordſhip's; nay, further, that his Lordſhip made uſe of Mr *Holloway*'s own reaſoning againſt the *like evaſion* on the other ſide, when *ſlurred in* by the aſſertors of the Hebrew primævity, to obviate the proofs brought againſt it's primævity, *from the old Canaanitiſh names.* His Lordſhip does not, indeed, ſpeak of this evaſion, as " *An*
" *inſtance of fooling and falſifying,*" or call it " *Brutum fulmen,*" or aſcribe it to " *Pre-*
" *ſumption, oppoſed to the Divine evidence*
" *of fact.*" (See *Primævity,* p. 9. and 10.) But his words are——

" *IT may be ſaid, that* Moſes *changed*
" *the true* Canaanitiſh *names, in conformity*
" *to the Hebrew idiom, for Hebrew names*
" *that*

" *that were more known and familiar to the*
" Iſraelites. *But this fancy, you* (ſays his
" Lordſhip to Mr *Holloway*) *reject with*
" *ſcorn, as not giving the true name, but*
" *the interpretation of it. And, I agree*
" *with you, this was not the caſe here, and*
" *is ſcarce allowable in an hiſtorical narra-*
" *tion. And ſince we are herein of the ſame*
" *opinion, we may come in time to think a-*
" *like of the Hebrew tongue.*"

WITH theſe mild words, the copy under his own hand, out of which I have taken ſo many paſſages ends, or breaks off. And, I am bereaved of all further guidance, or intelligence from himſelf, concerning his replies to the third, and fourth proofs alledged by Mr *Holloway*, at *p.* 6.

SECT.

## SECT. III.

BUT whereas there is a paſſage cited in *p.* 53. out of one of his Lordſhip's original letters, relating to the fourth proof, taken from the names, attributes, &c. of the Gentile idols, upon which Mr *Holloway* has remarked a good deal in that, and the four following pages, through miſapprehenſion, as I conceive, of his Lordſhip's meaning; I ſhall therefore take the liberty of examining his remarks by the paſſage itſelf.

MR *Holloway* owns, that what his Lordſhip ſays is "*Very ingeniouſly offered, and* "*maſterly expreſſed, but,* (as he adds) *in-* "*verting, as it does, the ſtate of things in* "*ſome particulars, it gives a miſtaken ac-* "*count of the point in queſtion.* For,

"1ſt. *THE learned Prelate took me to* "*ſuppoſe, that the Jews invented, or gave* "*names to the Heathen idols, or to as many* "*of*

" *of them as they worſhipped, which I by no* " *means do.*"

But there is nothing in the paſſage, as Mr *Holloway* gives it, from whence this can be inferred. On the contrary, his Lordſhip ſuppoſes nothing but what Mr *Holloway* ſays, (ibid.) *he ſees* and *knows*, viz. " *That the Iſraelites received their idolatry* " *from their Heathen neighbours the* Cana- " anites, Edomites, Syrians, &c. *and with* " *the things, did alſo take the names.*"

The only point in which they appear to differ is this. Mr *Holloway* thinks, that the names of theſe Gentile gods, which are properly Hebrew, were impoſed before the Diſperſion; and that thoſe which have only affinity with the Hebrew, were impoſed from *corrupted Hebrew* ſoon after the Diſperſion. See *p.* 54. Whereas his Lordſhip, on the other hand, looking upon all the proper Hebrew names to have been impoſed by the *Canaanites*, *Edomites*, *Moabites*, *&c.* who talked Hebrew, from their own language, thought thoſe others which are not properly Hebrew, ſhould be accounted for from the other Eaſtern tongues uſed in *Egypt*, *Nineveh*, and *Babylon*, from whence much idolatry was tranſplanted

tranſplanted into *Canaan*. And thus he ſupports what he had before ſaid, that "*The derivation of theſe names are not to be* "*fetched from the Biblical Hebrew, excluſive* "*of the other Eaſtern tongues.*"

And where is the wonder that the names of *idols*, *feaſts*, *rites*, &c. which were of *Canaanitiſh* inſtitution, ſhould be found to be either ſimple Hebrew, or of Hebrew fabricature, as that was the language of Old *Canaan*. *Ham* and his curſed progeny were, in Mr *Holloway*'s own account, the principal architects in idolatry, and the firſt apoſtates after the Flood. And to a very great height had their idolatry grown, when the *Iſraelites* took poſſeſſion of their land. The variety of their *deities*, *temples*, *&c.* including only ſuch as are mentioned in the Scriptures, was great: as Mr *Hutchinſon* has ſhewn in his *Trin. of the Gentiles*, though not quite ſo great as he repreſents it. And from what language could it be expected thoſe names ſhould have been taken, but from the language of their own country?

And as for thoſe names which could not be accounted for, or not ſo well accounted for from the Hebrew, his Lordſhip

ſhip ſuppoſed them to have been taken from the neighbouring Heathen countries, whoſe proper fabricature they were, correſponding with their ſeveral dialects. And when either the *Canaanites* or the *Iſraelites* borrowed *ſuch corruptions* of their *Gentile* neighbours, *they took*, (as his Lordſhip ſays) *the names alſo with the things.*

But his Lordſhip, it ſeems, has *inverted the ſtate of things* yet more. For,

" 2dly, *THE Biſhop ſuppoſed, that the* " *Iſraelitiſh nation, and the Biblical He-* " *brew tongue were coëval. Or, that this* " *language was at beſt no more than the pro-* " *vincial dialect of the* Canaanites, *ſome-* " *time formed like the other dialects and* " *tongues out of the* Noachic *language.*" p. 54.

What his Lordſhip could mean by the *Iſraelitiſh* nation, and the Biblical Hebrew being *coëval*, (if he ever ſo expreſſed himſelf) I cannot conceive, unleſs it were, that he did not account them *a nation*, till they were brought up out of bondage to poſſeſs the promiſed land; nor account their language *Biblical Hebrew*, 'till it had received thoſe additions and alterations which might have been made in it by

by the *Iſraelites*, during more than 200 years ſojournment in *Egypt*, and before *Moſes* wrote *the Pentateuch*.

BE this as it will; it is not denied that he made the other ſuppoſition, that is, his Lordſhip plainly took this language to be *a provincial dialect*, and to have been formed like other tongues, out of the *Noachic* language.

" *BUT there is no ſign*, (ſays Mr *Hol-*
" *loway*, ibid.) *or token, that either of theſe*
" *things were thus, but all the proof to the*
" *contrary that can be deſired.*"

DUE allowance being made for Mr *Holloway*'s hyperbolical manner of expreſſing himſelf on ſome occaſions, and alſo for his moderation and contentment with ſmall proofs, if they ſeem to make for him; I need not be under much pain, from this previous account, about what is to follow; which is,

" *FOR the* Biblical Hebrew, *as we*
" *ſtill have it exhibited* in writing, *or to*
" *ſpeak more properly*, the Biblical Hebrew
" Writing *is not* older, *nor ſo* old *as the*
" *people of* Iſrael. *But then it is clearly*
" *ſeen by that very Writing*,——*that the*
" language *it was* penned *in was much*
" older,

" older, *and of vaſtly greater extent than* " *the Iſraelitiſh, Canaanitiſh, or any other* " *nation in the world.*" p. 55.

When his Lordſhip ſpoke of the *Biblical Hebrew*, he meant thereby, as one would preſume, the Hebrew *in that ſtate of the language* in which we have it *exhibited in writing*. But Mr *Holloway*, that he may give us the phraſe under greater preciſion, ſubſtitutes *writing* inſtead of *tongue*; and then is pleaſed to obſerve, that this *writing* is not *ſo old* as the people of *Iſrael*, but the *tongue* itſelf is *much older* than they, or *the Canaanites*, or any other nation. And thus he has, in appearance, overturned at once both the ſuppoſitions he had aſcribed to his Lordſhip. For, as it is confeſſed, *the writing* was not *ſo old* as the people of *Iſrael*. The *Biblical Hebrew* was not, (if we will ſpeak properly with Mr *Holloway*) *coëval* with the Iſraelitiſh nation. And the tongue itſelf *being older* than any nation, (if we can *ſee by that very writing* as *clearly* as he doth that it is ſo) could not be a provincial dialect formed out of the Noachic language.

And the reaſons with which he ſupports, not only the antiquity but the

identity of this language from the beginning, immediately follow, *p.* 55. and ſhould be well attended to, as being, in his eſtimation, "*all the proof that can be* "*deſired.*" viz.

(1ſt.) "*THE ſeries of narrations deli-* "*vered in it, in one and the ſame tenor of* "*language, without the leaſt hint of any* "*tranſition from any former language to* "*that in which the Divine author wrote,* "*as diverſe from it: an event, which if* "*there had been any ſuch, could not but* "*have appeared.*"

IT would ſeem ſtrange, if in a ſeries of narrations, *the ſame writer* ſhould not uſe *the ſame tenor of language*, although he wrote accounts of different things and times. When any writer does otherwiſe, as *Daniel* and *Ezra* for inſtance, there is commonly an apparent reaſon for their not uſing *the ſame tenor of language* throughout. But, where no ſuch reaſon appears, a change of language is not ordinarily to be expected in any writer. Look among the narrations, interſperſed in the hiſtorical books of Scripture, of things that paſſed in *Egypt*, *Aſſyria*, &c. where other tongues were ſpoken; you will find them never-

nevertheleſs wrote in ſimple Hebrew, (a very few words excepted, for which the reaſons inſtantly appear) and *in one and the ſame tenor of language* in which the Sacred Penmen wrote, when they recorded the affairs of the Hebrews. Now, if theſe hiſtorical narrations of what was done in other countries, penned in Hebrew, be no proof that the *Egyptians*, *Aſſyrians*, &c. talked Hebrew too, then *Moſes* having wrote his account of the Creation, and his ſhort hiſtory of the Antediluvians in one and the ſame tenor of language, in which he wrote the affairs of the *Iſraelites* in *Canaan*, is no proof that the Hebrew of the Pentateuch was the language of *Adam*, and of the old world.

When Mr *Holloway* adds, that "*Moſes* gave not *the leaſt hint of any tranſition* "*from any former language*;" he ſeems to have entirely overlooked that very remarkable account that *Moſes* gave, of the language of the whole earth being confounded in the plains of *Shinaar*; which is ſo ſtrong an intimation of a tranſition from a former language, as might, if he had recollected it, have reſtrained him from

ſpeaking with ſo little caution, and reſerve on this head.

But "*Such an event, if there had been* "*any ſuch, could not but have appeared.*"

It hath appeared; for *Moſes*, though he hath omitted many things we ſhould be glad to know, hath thought fit to record this, as a very extraordinary event, (in the ſame tenor of language too, though the event was the confuſion of language) in which he penned his other narrations. And it is ſo far from being a matter of common doubt, whether *there had been any ſuch event* or not, that the belief of it hath generally prevailed, and *the tradition* of it *hath*, as Mr *Holloway* himſelf elſe where ſpeaks, *(Letter and Spirit*, p. 119.) *gone out into all the earth.* If, nevertheleſs, there be any to whom this memorable event, already on record, appears capable of another conſtruction, they may try to make the beſt of their own interpretation of it, but ſhould not go into ſuch an extreme of ſingularity as to deny that it is *a hint*, at leaſt, of *a tranſition* from one language to another.

The next reaſon Mr *Holloway* gives is,

(2dly.)

(2dly.) "*THE interlocutory diſcourſes* "*of ante-diluvian perſons, rehearſed as they* "*were uttered in the ſame language.*"

BUT who can know this, or be able with any degree of certainty to ſay ſo? If it can be ſhewn that *Adam*, *Eve*, *Cain*, and the two *Lamechs* ſpoke *thoſe very ſame* words by which *Moſes* relates their interlocutory diſcourſes; Mr *Holloway* will need no other argument, for this alone will prove all that he aims at.

BUT the bare ſaying ſo, though it hath been affirmed by *the Rabbins*, and aſſented to by ſome pious and learned Chriſtians, has not been taken for ſufficient evidence, when urged in proof of the primævity of the tongue.

*MOSES*'s hiſtory will be no leſs true, nor his Revelations leſs explicit, tho' they were not ſuppoſed to be penned in the *ante-diluvian* language, but in another language that aroſe out of it's confuſion. We have none even of our Bleſſed Saviour's *interlocutory diſcourſes* with his Diſciples and others; none of his divine precepts, and moſt ſalutary inſtructions rehearſed in *the ſame language* in which they were delivered by himſelf. We have only a few ſingle

words, and one or two ſhort ſentences rehearſed *as they were uttered by him*; which ſhew us, indeed, what language he ſpoke, but do not ſeem to ſerve any other material purpoſe. And yet the Goſpels, as we have them in Greek, and under this deficiency, if it may be called ſo, are ſufficiently *authentick*; properly *divine writings*, *his word*, and the *word of eternal life*.

*MOSES* likewiſe gives us the interlocutory diſcourſes of *Laban* the *Syrian*, of *Pharaoh*, of *Potiphar*'s wife, and other *Egyptians*, in pure Hebrew; when yet there is little room to doubt, (and Mr *Holloway* himſelf elſewhere allows, as in *p.* 32, 34.) that *the one* talked the *Aramitiſh* dialect, and the others the *Egyptian*; and why he might not as well give the *interlocutory diſcourſes of the ante-diluvians*, in a language they did not talk themſelves, it will become Mr *Holloway* to explain. It will not be eaſy to evade this reaſoning, unleſs we will preſume that *Laban* never talked *Syriac*, but when he called the heap of witneſs *Jegar Sahaduṫha*; that *Pharaoh* never talked in the *Egyptian* dialect, but when he named *Joſeph Zaphnath Paaneah*; nor

nor the people of *Egypt*, but when they cried *Abrech* before *Joſeph*, Gen. xli. 43. I ſay, unleſs we will preſume that they never talked their own language at other times, becauſe their words, on all other occaſions, are *rehearſed* by *Moſes* in *pure Hebrew*. And Mr *Holloway* himſelf, I think, would ſcarce admit of this preſumption, though it is very like his own, with reſpect to *the Ante-diluvians*.

ANOTHER of his reaſons is,

(3dly.) "*THE names of perſons and* "*things, with their reaſons etymologically* "*aſſigned in that language.*" (viz. the Biblical Hebrew.)

OF proper names *etymologized for us in the Sacred Hebrew*, (p. 22.) he gives us about half a ſcore inſtances. But all of them have been ſo often, and ſo thoroughly diſcuſſed by other writers, that I believe the critical reader, who carefully examines and compares Mr *Holloway*'s manner of expounding them *all* by the Hebrew, with what hath been ſaid by others, will be of opinion, that he hath left the matter in no reſpect more clear and ſatisfactory than he found it. For other learned men have judiciouſly remarked, that *ſome* of theſe

names, with their reaſons alſo, are as well made out by the *Chaldee*, or *Syriac*, as by the Hebrew, and *ſome* of them better: that *others* of them may be explained from the *Egyptian*, *Æthiopic*, *Arabic*, or *Armenian* dialects; that *ſome* of thoſe reaſons alſo, which he accounts to be etymologically aſſigned, are no more than *alluſions*; of which opinion was *Bochart* himſelf, the great aſſertor of the Hebrew Primævity.

REMITTING the reader therefore to the principal writers who have handled this ſubject, and who were ſpecially mentioned in the foregoing Diſcourſe, I ſhall enter here into no other particulars, but ſuch as immediately concern Mr *Holloway*'s reaſonings with his Lordſhip.

HE had urged, as a mark, or proof of the Hebrew Primævity, that *proper names* are given, and *their reaſons* aſſigned in that language. His Lordſhip had replied, *The names are too few to build a general obſervation upon.* And, I now add further, that *the reaſons* aſſigned for ſuch names are *fewer ſtill*; and that even ſome of thoſe too may be aſſigned etymologically *from other dialects*, as well as from the Hebrew. So that the number of words to be

be accounted properly Hebrew, either in *the names*, or in *the reaſons* aſſigned for them, is *ſo ſmall*, that it will not ſupport that weight of evidence which it is ſuppoſed by Mr *Holloway* to carry with it. For it ariſes no higher, in ſtrict reaſoning, than a proof that thoſe few words were *parts* of the primæval language, or terms in uſe among the *Ante-diluvians* at the time, or in the age when thoſe names were impoſed, or thoſe reaſons aſſigned; in like manner as the words in *Syriac*, or other dialects, by which ſome of the etymologies are better accounted for than by the Hebrew, are according to the ſame way of reaſoning to be reckoned *part* of the Ante-diluvian language too. And where the etymologies, or the reaſons aſſigned for them belong to any other dialect rather than the Hebrew, yet *Moſes* in giving the names and reaſons of them, *as nearly as the Hebrew can expreſs them*, cannot be ſaid to tranſgreſs in hiſtorical narration, any more than he doth *in relating*, (as was obſerved above) in the language he wrote in, *the interlocutory diſcourſes* which were delivered in other dialects in *Syria* or *Egypt*.

It will ſometimes happen, and it is obvious to conceive why it ſhould, that the propriety of an etymology which is taken from one language, when the reaſon of it is given in another language, will not ſo readily appear to us, although the reaſon of it be truly given in that other language. See what difficulties the Commentators are put to in endeavouring to derive *Boanerges*, (*Mark* iii. 17.) in the language of *Jeruſalem*, ſo as to make it ſignify what it is explained, *The ſons of thunder*. Yet none will ſay, that St *Mark*'s Goſpel is either falſe in this article, or imperfect in expreſſing the true etymological meaning of that name, according to the language from whence it was impoſed.—So again, *Thou art* πετρος, *and on this rock* πετρα *will I build*, &c. (*Matth.* xvi. 18.) When yet neither the true original name that was impoſed on *Simon*, nor the word whence the reaſon of it was etymologically aſſigned, are given by *this Evangeliſt*.

And ſo much for the *names of perſons*. As for the *names of things* to which Mr *Holloway* here alſo refers, as evidences to his purpoſe, the ſame anſwer may ſerve in

in ſome reſpects, but in others it ſhould be enlarged.

He had expreſſed himſelf, concerning the appellatives, more fully in another paſſage, (*Primævity*, p. 12.) where he ſays.

" *BUT there are alſo many appellative* " *as well as proper names, with their reaſons* " *etymologically aſſigned in the Hebrew Bible;* " *where their renderings in the derived lan-* " *guages, the Chaldee, Arabic, &c. fail or* " *deviate, as not being able to ſuit the ſaid* " *etymological reaſons after the ſame manner* " *to the names; which is evidence of the* " *Primævity of* that *with reſpect to* all " theſe."

When we except out of the *many appellatives*, whoſe reaſons are here ſaid to be aſſigned in the Hebrew Bible, all thoſe which he imagines to be compounded, and to carry their own reaſons in themſelves, and which are *etymologized for us*, not in Scripture, but in his book of *originals*, (of which *compounds* more hereafter) the number will be found extremely *few:* and even with reſpect to *thoſe few*, his argument doth not appear to be properly ſtated; for it reaches only to the *renderings*

*ings* in the Polyglot Bible, which *fail or deviate*, &c. and not to the *languages*, whoſe renderings they are; ſince it may be ſhewn that thoſe languages *have words*, whereby they *are able to ſuit the etymological reaſons to the names, after the ſame manner* that the Hebrew doth.

I SHALL examine one inſtance, which ſeems the ſtrongeſt in Mr *Holloway*'s favour, and by which a judgment may be made of the reſt.

HE obſerves, the name *Iſhah* was given to *woman, becauſe ſhe was taken out of Iſh, man.* " *But the Syriac* (as he adds, *p.* 16. " of his *Primævity) and the Samaritan* " *ſay, the woman ſhould be called* Antetha, " *becauſe ſhe was taken out of* Gabar, *an-* " *other name for man, to which* Antetha " *has no relation.*"

THE obſervation is juſt with regard to the *Syriac* verſion in the *Polyglot* by *Antetha*, but is not ſo with regard to the *language itſelf.* Becauſe the *Syrians* from *Gabar* maſculine regularly form a feminine; which is to be found in their Lexicons and Grammars, though it be antiquated; and on that account moſt probably, not uſed by the tranſlator.

So

So likewiſe, when he objects againſt the Vulgate for reading, "*She ſhould be* "*called* Virago, *becauſe ſhe was taken* de "Viro; which (ſays he, *p.* 17.) *is to loſe* "*ſight of both the name, and reaſon of the* "*Original.*"——This objection had been prevented, if the Vulgate had read it, as *Druſius* does, viz. *Vira de Viro: Vira* being an old Latin word for *Fœmina*, or *Mulier*, according to *Feſtus*. And then both the name and the reaſon of it would have been as proper in the Latin, as in the preſent Hebrew.

And the ſame may be ſaid of *Symmachus*'s verſion κληθησεῖαι ανδρις, and of the French, *on la nommera Hommeſſe*, as diſtinguiſhed from *Hommaſſe*.

Now, when the tranſlators of the Hebrew Bible, whoſe renderings are given in the Polyglot, had words to expreſs the reaſon of the etymology by, but did not uſe them, it was their fault, ſo far as it may be deemed a fault. Yet ſtill the truth of the narration is preſerved, if it ſufficiently appear from their renderings, that the name was given in the original, ſuiting the reaſon therein alledged, for it's impoſition, whether the tranſlation of the word, which

which imports *the reaſon*, be the ſame with that which tranſlates *the name* or not.

And as for thoſe other appellatives, which are ſuppoſed to carry their etymologies in their compoſition, as being "*Deſcriptive of ſomething eminently diſtinctive in the natures, qualities, &c. of the things ſeverally denominated by them.*" (*Primævity*, p. 12.) The legitimacy of their compoſition ſhould be made out, and eſtabliſhed before they can juſtly be brought as evidence in this queſtion. Mr *Holloway* has produced ſeveral examples of this kind of compound words in his originals; ſome of which I have examined on a former occaſion: but I ſhall here only take notice of two or three, in which he inſtances on this occaſion, and re-conſiders as remarkable proofs of the propriety and expreſſiveneſs, as well as Primævity of the Hebrew Tongue.—*p.* 17. and 19.

"שרץ——*The name of* creeping things "*produced by the waters——ſo named from the manner of their production by ſpawning, i. e. literally from their breaking out abundantly, as by colliſion, contrition, &c. from their ſpawn. The word is compounded of the relative* ש which, *and* רצץ *to break*

" *break out as aforeſaid by attrition, colli-*
" *ſion,* &c. *of the airs with the parts of the*
" *ſpawn, the waters on which it is caſt,* &c."

HAD this compound been recommended to his Lordſhip as *deſcriptive of ſomething eminently diſtinctive in the nature of creeping things*, he would probably have aſked what there is in this word, *ſo peculiar to creeping things*, as to *diſtinguiſh them from all other things* that are produced by *breaking out abundantly by attrition and coliſion of air and water with their conſtituent parts?* All vegetation from ſeeds, all generation from oviparous animals, is performed in the ſame way; neither is there any thing in *the name*, even after it is ſo philoſophically explained, that *paints in the mind* (to uſe his Lordſhips own words) *a more compleat idea of the object*, (viz. creeping things) *than what the mere ſound of the word would give, if the name had been impoſed arbitrarily.*

ארץ is another of Mr *Holloway*'s inſtances, (*Primævity*, p. 15.) of a word that no tranſlation can reach, ſo as to expreſs it properly. One reaſon for this he has himſelf, I think, furniſhed us with, viz. that he is not ſure after all, what the true

true *radical* ſignification of *Arets* is. For in *his Originals* it is conſtructed of "רוץ "*which ſignifies to run out in ſmall parts,* "*like the atoms of fire in lightning* (Nah. ii. "4.) *and to diſtribute by portions,* (2 Chron. "xxxv. 13.) *and of* רצץ, *which ſignifies* "*to bruiſe, or break in pieces. Theſe terms* "(ſays he) *as far as is our purpoſe to ex-* "*plain, deſcribe what is done to the earth,* "*and thoſe other parts mixed with it to* "*ſupply matter for vegetation.*" Vol. II. p. 313.

But in his *Primævity*, when it is *to his purpoſe to explain it otherwiſe*, "ארץ "*has verbs of it's own* רוץ *and* רצץ *to ex-* "*preſs the tremulous motion of the earth, in* "*the courſe of it's revolution round the ſun.*" p. 15.

And ſurely no verſion or term in any other language, can reach the full meaning of a word, whoſe ſignification is ſo *complex*, if *both* theſe accounts may ſtand; or ſo *indefinite* and uncertain, if we know not *which of them* may ſtand.

Besides, how ſhall we be ſure that one of the roots, viz. רצץ, is not to be underſtood in this compoſition, as it is in *Sherets* abovementioned, where it ſignifies *literally*

*literally to break out abundantly by attrition, colliſion, &c.?* And another queſtion may be put now, which could not be aſked before, viz. How ſhall it be known whether *Sherets* may not alſo be compounded with רוץ as well as רצץ, *verbs of it's own root, to expreſs* ſomething of *a tremulous motion* of creeping things *in their natural courſe of progreſſion?* For no reaſon, I conceive, can be given why the ſyllable רץ, when in junction with the relative ש, ſhould not have the ſame meaning, as it hath in junction with the prefix א, if it carry in either caſe the ſignification of רצץ ſingly, or of רוץ and רצץ conjunctly.

רמש is the third inſtance of the ſame kind that he produces. (*Primævity*, p. 19.) "*This noun* (he ſays) *is a name for the ge-*
"*nus of creeping things produced out of the*
"*earth:*" And has therefore a cloſe connexion in ſenſe both with *Sherets* and *Arets, creeping things*, and *earth*. A much cloſer, indeed, with *Sherets* than he ſeems to apprehend. For though he blames the *Syriac* and the *Chaldee* tranſlators here, for rendering רמש by רחשה "*The word they*
"*had before employed to expreſs the genus of*
"*moving things produced by the waters, and*

" *ſo confound kinds of animals originally di-*
" *ſtinct.*" *(Ibid.)* Yet if his cenſure were juſt, it would fall on *Moſes* himſelf, who uſes the verb רמש, (whoſe noun is appropriated according to Mr *Holloway* to the genus of *creeping things produced out of the earth)* to expreſs the moving of the other genus produced by the waters, *Gen.* i. 21. " *Every living creature* הרמשת *that moveth,*
" *which the waters brought forth abundantly*
" *after their kind.*" And *Lev.* xi. 46. *Every living creature that moveth in the waters,* Heb. הרמשת במים; *and every living creature that creepeth on the earth,* Heb. השרצת על הארץ. Whence it appears, that *Moſes* did not make the diſtinction which Mr *Holloway* would perſuade us was originally made between *Sherets* and *Remeſh.* If he ſpoke of רמש ארץ, *Gen.* i. 24. רמש האדמה, ver. 25. it is ſaid alſo of the *great and wide ſea* שם רמש, *there are creeping things innumerable,* Pſal. civ. 24. On which text, I find our Engliſh verſion, by *creeping things,* diſapproved by Mr *Edwards,* who obſerves, " *the Hebrew word* רמש *ſhould be rendered*
" *ſwimming, for that* (ſays he) *is the deno-*
" *tation of the word, when applied to fiſhes.*"

*Edwards*

*Edwards on Scripture*, Vol. III. p. 533. An obſervation, I think, more juſt than Mr *Holloway*'s on the *Chaldee* tranſlation abovementioned. In a word, we find in the books of *Moſes* himſelf, both theſe expreſſions, רמש הרמש על הארץ, *Gen.* i. 26. and שרץ השרץ על הארץ, *Lev.* xi. 29. One would be glad to know how Mr *Holloway* will diſtinguiſh here.

BUT it is in the compoſition of the word, I preſume, that we ſhall find, from the very reaſon of the name, it's appropriation to Land-Reptiles. For Mr *Holloway* tells us, *Originals*, *Vol.* II. p. 207. that,

"*THE name is a compound of* רמה *to* "*project*, or fling forward, *and* מוש *to cede*, "or give way."

YET in his *Primævity*, p. 19. "*The* "*word is a compound term, derived from* "*the two roots* רום *and* מוש, *to raiſe*; *and* "*cede, or proceed, and ſo draw after,* "*ſomething of the ſenſe of the cognate root* "משה *being alſo included.*"

HERE are then four roots propounded for the diſcovery of the original of this name: and which lead us to ſome general, indiſtinct idea of the vermicular motion of caterpillars, ſnails, earth-worms, &c. ex-

cluſive of other kinds of land reptiles. And it matters not which of the compounds we chuſe, for the manner of the reptile's *action in creeping* is expreſſed, he ſays, in either of them, viz. when *Ramah* is one of the roots in compoſition "*They* "*gather up and project, or make a puſh with* "*their hinder part.*" *Originals, ibid.* And when *Rûm* is one of the roots in the compound, the manner of their action is expreſſed, "*By raiſing and projecting their* "*forepart.*" *Primævity, ibid.* *Mûſh* alſo has different ſenſes in theſe different compounds. When joined with *Ramah* it expreſſes "*Their forepart ceding or giving* "*way.*" *Originals, ibid.* When joined with Rûm it is, "*To cede or proceed, and* "*ſo draw after,*" by a ſenſe borrowed from *Maſhah*. *Primævity, ibid.*

AND thus Mûſh ſignifying in it's radical or primary ſenſe *to cede*, may be made in different applications to ſignify *receding*, or it's reverſe *proceeding*. *Retrograde*, or *progreſſive*, as the etymologiſt finds it moſt convenient to interpret it.

MR *Holloway* obſerves, that the *Arabic* verſion expreſſes *Remeſh* both noun and verb, by "*A term no way proper, as* "*deriving*

" *deriving a name for the creeping kind of* " *animals formed out of the earth, from a* " *word in the original ſignifying the flowing* " *of liquors.*" Primævity, *p.* 19.

I SHOULD not find any great fault in this on Mr *Holloway*'s own principles. For the action of worms, maggots, &c. *in creeping* does more reſemble *the motion of fluids*, than the action of any other genus of terreſtrial animals doth. And Mr *Holloway*'s manner of deſcribing the vermicular motion of animals, by *ceding* or *giving way*, *proceeding* and *drawing after*, &c. may be as apt a deſcription of *the flowing of liquors* as it is of *Remeſh*.

" *BUT this Arabic language* (he tells " us) *is above all others a vaſt ocean of cor-* " *ruptions, often expreſſing a multitude of* " *things no ways related to one another by* " *ſome ſingle word—whilſt the Hebrew itſelf* " *keeping it's roots clear, certain, and di-* " *ſtinct, is, after all, in reality more copi-* " *ous than this, and all the other pretended* " *rival dialects.*" (Primævity, *p.* 20.)

YET there are ſome, I fear, who by endeavouring to make the Hebrew expreſs every thing they have a mind it ſhould, eſpecially in compound words, do in re-

ality make it ſeem as *obſcure*, *uncertain*, and *indiſtinct*, as the *Arabic* itſelf is here ſaid to be.

I COME now to the laſt inſtance in which his Lordſhip is ſuppoſed to have miſunderſtood Mr *Holloway*'s meaning: and in which Mr *Holloway* ſets himſelf right, (*Primævity*, p. 56.) in theſe words.

" 3dly, *I do not ſay the derivations of the* " *names of the Gentile gods, rites, &c. are* " *to be fetched from the Biblical Hebrew* " *tongue, excluſive of their own ſeveral* " *tongues.* —— *This only I affirm, that to* " *trace them to their firſt fountains we muſt* " *go up the dialectic ſtream, and carry them* " *back to the Hebrew: becauſe where they* " *are not ſtill pure Hebrew, they are appa-* " *rent deflexions from, or corruptions of it,* " *and ſo can only be fully and finally expli-* " *cated by it.*"

HAD this explanation of Mr *Holloway*'s meaning come before his Lordſhip, he would probably have aſked, before he made any reply to it, for ſome examples of *foreign words, traced to their firſt fountain, by going up the Dialectic Stream.*

AND as Mr *Holloway* has been pleaſed, in *his Primævity*, to exemplify this method

thod of derivation in three or four inſtances, I cannot better fulfil my part on this article, than by laying them before the reader, and ſubmitting them, with a few remarks of my own, to his judgment.

"אברך *Gen.* xli. 43. * *is an Egyptian* "*word, to be decyphered only by the Hebrew,* "*without which it would be a more cant* "*word, of no certain or rational meaning* "*at all.*" (Primævity, *p.* 36.)

WHY ſo? Can no word have a good meaning but what comes from the Hebrew? Might not *Rech*, a Coptic word for *inclinare*, (whence Dr *Wilkins* derived it) afford as rational a ſenſe as the Hebrew ברך *genua flectere?* (Whence our tranſlators have rendered it) Or might not *Abrech* ſignify *Præconium*, (a ſenſe to which the LXX points) in the Egyptian dialect, without being thought a mere cant word?

MR *Holloway*, indeed, thinks the LXX, whoſe words are Εκηρυξεν εμπροσθεν αυτȣ Κηρυξ, read it אב קורא *the father*, or *chief herald.* p. 35. But in ſome of the Oriental

 tongues

* The text is——"*And he* (viz. Pharaoh) *made him* "(viz. Joſeph) *to ride in the ſecond chariot, which he had,* "*and they cried before him,* Bow the knee. (*Marg.* "Abrech.) *And he ſet him over all the land of* Egypt."

tongues בורח is *Præco*, from ברח *clamavit, præconizavit*. See *Schindler*, *Caſtell*, &c. Hence probably the Greek Βραχω, *clamo*. And Αβραχεν, ηχησεν, as it is explained by *Heſychius*: So Εβραχεν by εβοησε. ibid. Εβρυχεν by εψοφησεν, ηχησεν. ibid. And Βρηχανωμενοι, by φωνουντες και χασμωμενοι, ibid.

OR if it be of Hebrew original, muſt it therefore take in all the ſenſes that Mr *Holloway* gives it from the various conjectures of different writers? Some, for inſtance, expound it as a compound of אב and ברך (in a different ſenſe of that verb, from that by which our verſion renders it, viz. * *Bow the knee*) and interpret it by *Father of Bleſſing* †, And others, as a compound of אב and רך, and render it (as our tranſlation doth in the margin) by *tender Father* ‡. But Mr *Holloway* will have all the three interpretations included in the compound. אברך (ſays he) "*Is* "*a mixt*

* Our verſion ſuppoſes אברך in the Egyptian manner of pronouncing, to be the ſame with הברך. Or, as *R. Dav.* ſays, *Aleph ponitur vice* ה; thus *Iſa.* lxiii. 3. אנאלתי is put for הגאלתי. And *Jer.* xxv. 3. אשכים for השכים.

† *Romaine*, Ind. Nom. Prop.

‡ Rab. *Judas*: & *Hieronymus* in Quæſt. Hebraicis. Vide *Fagium* & *Druſium* int. Crit. Sacr.

" *a mixt compound of* אב ברך *and* רך.
" *And ſo was to expreſs altogether*, Father
" of Bleſſing, to whom they were to
" bow the knee, tender, nouriſhing fa-
" ther. *This probably was an attribute of*
" *the Egyptians god of fertility, fecundity,*
" *&c. to whom they paid the higheſt adora-*
" *tion.*" And whereas others ſay, that רך is an *Arabic* and *Syriac* word for King, and *Onkelos* has interpreted the compound by *Father of the King*, therefore Mr *Holloway* will ſuppoſe this ſenſe might be included too.—— " *It might alſo* (ſays he)
" *take in the Aramitiſh* ריכא a King. *In*
" *which reſpect* אברך *might alſo ſignify the*
" King's Father, *or* Rex Pater *jointly. It*
" *was doubtleſs an attribute of one of their*
" *gods.*" Primævity, *p.* 34.

But here he himſelf aſks, " *How came* ריכא *to ſignify a King?*" For it muſt be decyphered, I ſuppoſe, only by the Hebrew, without which it would be *a mere cant word, of no certain or rational meaning at all.*

" *MUST it not* (ſays he) *have been a*
" *corruption of the Hebrew* ראש a Prince,
" *by putting* כ Ch *for* ש Sh *as the French*

" *and*

" *and ſome other languages even do pronounce* " *their* Ch *at this day?*" (ibid.)

To which I anſwer, that if no word can have a meaning except it come from the Hebrew, I do not know how ריכא, if it means *a King*, can be better *traced to it's firſt fountain*, than in this dialectic deduction of it from ראש, which he propoſes. But if words belonging properly to other languages may have rational meanings, I apprehend it more reaſonable to look upon this as a *Syriac term originally*, than to decypher it by the Hebrew, according to the foregoing rule. The ſame I would obſerve as to *Abrech*. For notwithſtanding what Dr *Patrick* ſays upon it, that " Unleſs we underſtood the old Egyp- " tian language we had as good reſt in " the Hebrew derivation as in any other, " according to our own tranſlation." Yet, on the other hand, we had better, I think, ſuppoſe it *altogether Egyptian*, and inexplicable by us, than Hebraize it, by making it a compound of four different words, and giving it a ſignification combined of the ſignifications of them *all*. For if ſuch complicated derivations are once allowed, there is not a word in any language but what

what may, in like manner, be *fully and finally explicated by the Hebrew*, into as many ſenſes as it contains letters.

SPEAKING of derived dialects, at the end of this paragraph, *p.* 36. he ſays,

"*CORRUPTIONS of roots, originally of another language, will ſplit and divide from ſimilitudes of ſounds into words and terms of many heterogeneous meanings; which will, indeed, produce copiouſneſs, but of ſolœciſms and improprieties only.*"

BUT ſome part of this charge is likely to fall upon his original language too, if terms in it may be compounded of ſeveral ſplit and divided words, and carry the heterogeneous meanings of them all, though they have only ſingle letters from ſome of them.

TO proceed to another inſtance of carrying words back to the Hebrew.

THERE is a very difficult word, indeed, which he expounds by this method. He ſuppoſes it to be *an attribute of an Egyptian deity*, and therefore it comes properly under enquiry here.

*Primævity, ibid.* —— "*THE* LXX, "*who were Alexandrian Jews, wrote* צפנת "*and* פענח *in one long-hard-ſounding word,*

"*probably*

" *probably as the Egyptians themſelves had*
" *corruptly pronounced it*, ψονθομφανηχ, *which*
" *in Greek letters is a barbariſm without*
" *meaning.*"

*Zaphnath Paaneah* was the name that *Pharaoh* gave to *Joſeph*: *Gen.* xli. 45. Which is variouſly interpreted. By *Jerom* and the *Vulgate*, *Salvator mundi.*—— By others, *Cuſtos Theſauri totius mundi.*— By others, *Somniorum conjector.*—By others, who follow the Hebrew ſenſe of צפן, *Occultorum Repertor*, or, *Theſauros reconditos aperiens*; for צפן ſignifies *reponere*, or *recondere*, as well as *abſcondere*, and צפון *reconditus Theſaurus:* and פענח is *aperuit*, according to *Bonjour* in his *Diſſert. de Nomine Patriarchæ Joſephi*, *Romæ*, 1696. Any of which conſtructions ſuit well with the character of *Joſeph*. But Mr *Holloway* ſuppoſes each word a compound of different roots. He tells us, that צפן, from whence צפנת, is a compound of צוף to *overflow*, or *cover*, and פני *the face* of any thing. And פענח is a compound of יפע to *irradiate*, and נח *conſolation*. So that both words taken together, ſignify *the comfortable or joyous revealer of ſecrets*. *Orig. Vol.* II. p. 67. *Primævity*, p. 36. Which,

if

if he had not thus explained in an inverted order of the compound words, I ſhould have ſuppoſed, ought rather to be interpreted, *The coverer of the face of irradiating comfort.*

He obſerves in his Originals, that the "*Words in their dialectical figuration were* "*Egyptian*; *but, for their etymology and* "*original conſtruction, are to be ſought* "*where they only can be found in the origi-* "*nal Hebrew:*" or rather, I will preſume to add, *in his Originals, and Primævity.*

To account then for this depraved word ψονθομφανηχ, uſed by the LXX, and *Joſephus*, he ſays, "*It might be an attri-* "*bute of their Anubis, i. e. the Dog-Star,* "*whom by a corruption of another Hebrew* "*word they alſo named, Sothis; and by a* "*ſecond corruption, Thotes.*" (Primævity, ibid.) And from theſe inſtructions the reader may find out the reſt (for he ſays no more about it) and may ſee it is an *apparent deflexion from*, or *corruption of the Hebrew*, and *can only be fully and finally explicated by the Hebrew.*

Once more, to ſhew how far his rule will reach in application, he tells us, *Primævity*, p. 40, that the *Indians* have an idol

idol called *Routeren*, " *To which they aſ-*
" *cribe the deſtruction of things; and ſo their*
" *ſaid name, Routeren, ſignifies that which*
" *ſhakes, and breaks the order of bodies and*
" *forms, it being a mixed compound of* רדד
" to caſt down, רטט trembling, and תור
" the form and order of things. *This*
" *name, therefore, is older than the preſent*
" *Indian language.*"

THAT is to ſay, though in it's dialectical figuration it is *Indian*, yet the etymology, or original conſtruction of it, is only to be found in Hebrew, by carrying it back thither, or tracing it up the Dialectic Stream to it's firſt fountain; not excluſively indeed of ſome fabricature from the *Indians* themſelves; for the termination of the name by E N is left unexplained, as a dialectical figuration of foreign and baſer contexture.

AND thus much may ſuffice for Mr *Holloway*'s manner of reducing the names of the Heathen deities to the Biblical Hebrew, in oppoſition to a notion of his Lordſhip's, that they ought to be fetched from the dialects, or languages of the countries where they were firſt impoſed.

SECT.

## SECT. IV.

BUT he hath not yet done with his Lordſhip's ſentiments, for he tells us in *p.* 57.

"*THE learned Prelate had two ſuppoſi-*
"*tions, which,* (ſays he) *I received with*
"*thanks, though I ſtill diſagree ſo much with*
"*him as to their application.*"

THIS is ingenuous, and encourages me to hope, that although I ſhall endeavour to vindicate his Lordſhip in both theſe points; yet Mr *Holloway*, how much ſoever he may diſagree with me, will take no offence at what I offer.

"*HE held*" (therefore it was more than a ſuppoſition in his Lordſhip) "*He*
"*held there was a Noachic language, as he*
"*affected to call it.*" Primævity, ibid.

BUT I apprehend there was no more *affectation* in his Lordſhip's uſe of the epithet *Noachic*, than there is in Mr *Holloway's*

*way*'s *Edenic* Garden. (*Pref.* to *Primævity*, p. 21.) *Cainitic* imaginations, (*Letter and Spirit*, p. 115.) &c. &c. Neither was there any *affectation* in ſubſtituting (if that be the ſingularity ſuppoſed) *Noachic* inſtead of *primitive* or *antediluvian*, &c. becauſe there was a plain reaſon why it ſhould be diſtinguiſhed from them, to prevent miſconſtructions of his meaning: Which was to denote more preciſely the *primitive* or *antediluvian* language, *in that ſtate it was in* when tranſmitted by *Noah* to the Poſt-diluvians, after all the changes it had undergone in the ſpace of ſixteen hundred years and upwards.

" *HE held*" alſo, (ibid.) " *that the other* " *languages were formed in different places* " *and times out of it.*" But this which is now made a *tenet*, was really no more than *a ſuppoſition*. And Mr *Holloway* ſhould have remembered what his Lordſhip told him in the letter quoted above; " *That of* " *Data we have too few to form any other* " *opinion than what is conjectural*;" where he likewiſe added, " *And I would have* " *mine paſs for ſuch.*"

LET it then be his conjecture. And what ſays Mr *Holloway* upon it?

WHY,

WHY, that his Lordſhip " SO admitted " THAT * *the confuſion of tongues,* " *which leads to the truth I aſſert on the* " *point, viz. that the language which* Noah " *and his family received from the former* " *Patriarchs, was the ſame with that which* " Shem *and his family uſed afterwards,* " *and that this was the Hebrew.*"

BUT ſurely Mr *Holloway* in making this inference (if I underſtand him right) from his Lordſhip's, taking the Hebrew to have been formed from the Noachic language, and not derived down by *Sem*'s line, but *Cham*'s; has ſome way *inverted the ſtate of things*, and by an induction, made by the rule of contraries, has *given a miſtaken account* of his Lordſhip's ſentiments.

" *FOR*, (ſays he) *the ſudden and early* " *change, or confuſion of tongues, which* " *makes ſome people ſuppoſe, without reaſon,* " *that Hebrew muſt have been confounded,* " *or loſt under that event; is, upon the Bi-*

* I give the word in capitals, the better to expreſs what I preſume to be the meaning, viz. ſo admitted *that to be* the confuſion of tongues which leads, &c. Or, the confuſion of tongues to have been *ſuch in fact, as* leads, &c.

" *ſhop's ſuppoſitions, of no ſudden, but a gra-*
" *dual confuſion taken away.*" Ibid.

BUT my Lord's own expreſſions (ſee *Primævity*, p. 5.) cannot juſtly be drawn into this conſtruction. He looked on the *Noachic* language to have been confounded, or broken at once. He ſpoke of the tranſaction at *Babel*, as of *the ſhipwreck* of the primitive tongue. But he ſuppoſed, nevertheleſs, *the formation* of other languages, (among which the Hebrew) out of it's planks, or broken parts, to have required ſome time, and to have been done by degrees, not on a ſudden. Yet this *gradual formation* is interpreted by Mr *Holloway*, of a *gradual confuſion*.

THUS again, at *p.* 68.— " *The learned*
" *Biſhop ſuppoſes the Primæval language,*
" *(which he calls the Noachic) to have been*
" *confounded by degrees among ſeveral peo-*
" *ple, at different times; and the other*
" *tongues, as the* Chaldee, Syriac, Scy-
" thian, &c. *to have been formed out of it.*
" *Which is diſtinct and clear ſenſe. And*
" *though erroneous, yet neceſſarily leads (by*
" *a little proper correction) to the truth on*
" *the point.*"

His Lordſhip gave a ſenſe, I think, ſtill more diſtinct, and clear. He ſuppoſed the *Biblical Hebrew*, as well as the *Syriac*, or the *Scythian*, to have ariſen out of the remains of the ONE language which was ſpoken at *Shinaar*, and which was alſo confounded there. He ſuppoſed theſe dialects to have been *gradually* improved, and enlarged, as convenience recommended, and to have admitted, each of them, ſuch alterations, as cuſtom is generally found to introduce into all languages. Which ſuppoſition, if it be not *erroneous*, (and it ſhould not be ſaid to be ſo, till ſome probable reaſon is given that it is ſo) will, indeed, neceſſarily *lead to the truth of ſome point*; but it will not lead neceſſarily, nor indeed at all, even with Mr *Holloway*'s *little proper correction*, to the truth of *his point*, viz. that the *Noachic* language was the *very Hebrew tongue*, however the other dialects were produced.

Mr *Holloway*, indeed, ſeems to make ſlight of all ſuppoſitions on this queſtion, but his own.

" *TO ſay there was a thing, act, or event,* " *and not alſo to produce ſome proof of it, is* " *much too bold.*" Primævity, *p.* 9.

I THINK ſo too, and wiſh Mr *Holloway* would always bear this in mind.

——"*TO ſay there MIGHT be ſome* "*ſuch matter, no leſs childiſh.*"—ibid.

THIS likewiſe I acknowledge, unleſs there be ſome *manly* reaſons to ground the conjecture upon.

"*TO ſay either, againſt the nobleſt evi-* "*dence that ever was to be had of any hi-* "*ſtorical matter of fact in the world, and* "*that* in re ſacrâ, *is what I have no name* "*for.*" ibid.

NOR I neither, but what is a very bad one. However, in the preſent caſe, we need not look out for ſuch a name as it deſerves, till he has ſhewn his *evidence* to be *as noble* as he affirms. And, in the mean time, till ſome real proofs of the Primævity of the Hebrew are produced, as well as talked of, it is not *ſo very bold to ſay*, they have not yet appeared.——And to make a ſuppoſition with a *may be*, againſt another *may be* conjecture, is not *ſo very childiſh*. We muſt reaſon upon probabilities as well as we can, when the knowledge of facts is ſo imperfectly tranſmitted to us, that we cannot argue otherwiſe upon them than *ex hypotheſi*.

I THINK

I THINK I have omitted nothing in Mr *Holloway*'s piece upon the Primævity, &c. in which his Lordſhip ſeems to be concerned. And as to the author's particular quarrel with the *Arabic Tongue* and with *the Arabic Profeſſor*, though I have the greateſt reſpect for the *latter*, I have ſo little knowledge of the *former*, that I muſt not preſume to enter into it: eſpecially as it would not well become even a maſter of that language to take upon himſelf a part, though for the ſake of Dr *Hunt*, which nobody can ſuſtain with ſo much credit, and to ſo great effect, as Dr *Hunt* himſelf.

I SHALL therefore only make one reflexion upon what Mr *Holloway* ſays of the learned and worthy *Profeſſor*, (which I think is not foreign to the deſign of this Diſcourſe) viz. that the friends to Biſhop *Chandler*'s memory ſhould the leſs wonder at the unkind uſage his Lordſhip has met with from this author, to whom he was perſonally a ſtranger, when they obſerve in what manner Dr *Hunt* is treated in the ſame

piece, though he is *one*, for whom the author ſays, p. 58. he hath "*Long had* "*a great perſonal reſpect, and no leſs opi-* "*nion of his good Meaning, Orthodoxy, and* "*Ability.*"

DISCOURSE

# DISCOURSE III.

## SECT. I.

*An enquiry into the force of Mr* Holloway's *Arguments, to prove that the ancient* Hebrew *letters were* not the ſame *as thoſe which are now called the* Samaritan.

MR *Holloway* took occaſion in his *Remarks* on my *Diſſertations*, to introduce his opinion, by way of digreſſion from his ſubject, about the *old Hebrew character*. He gave notice of it in his title page, under the ſtile of——"*A* "*word on the Hebrew and Samaritan Al-*"*phabets, proving that thoſe Alphabets could* "*not have been changed the one for the other,* "*in copying the Hebrew Scriptures after the* "*Babyloniſh Captivity, as hath been pre-*"*tended*;"——but nevertheleſs this digreſſion makes eight pages in thirty-five; that

is, near a fourth part of his *Remarks on my pieces.*

Now though I had no hand, or concern in putting him upon this enquiry, and was under no obligation to consider what he said upon it, in my late Defence. Yet as he has thrown it so particularly in my way, and as the question concerning the true ancient Hebrew character commonly accompanies that of the primævity of the language; and especially, as I think Mr *Holloway* has not made good what he undertook to prove; I shall take the freedom to examine into the grounds upon which he hath wrought himself into the sentiment which he now maintains.

The question is, whether the Hebrew Scriptures were originally wrote in the square letter, now commonly called the *Hebrew character*, (but supposed to have been anciently the proper *Chaldee character*) or in that which is now called the *Samaritan* character, and is still preserved in the *Samaritan* Pentateuch, and in the *Samaritan* version thereof.

" *A proof of this point* (says Mr *Holloway*, p. 35.) *is much wanted by the learned world. Many volumes having been published*

" *liſted on this argument, only to confound* " *and puzzle the cauſe.*"

So much indeed hath been wrote, and by ſo many men of great repute for their knowledge in the Oriental tongues, as well as in all kinds of literature *, that had not Mr *Holloway* ſtarted what I take to be a new thought, and which is offered by him as a deciſive argument; I ſhould not have hazarded ten lines in the controverſy. For as Dr *Prideaux* obſerves, *Conn.* Vol. I. all that can be ſaid upon it to purpoſe, hath already been brought together by *Lud. Capellus* and *Buxtorf.* And an abridgement of the whole diſpute hath lately been made by *Calmet*, in a diſſertation before the firſt book of *Ezra*, intitled—*Diſſertation ou l'on examine ſi Eſdras a changé les anciens caracteres Hebreux, pour leur ſubſtituer les lettres Chaldeennes.* Vol. III.

MR

* Dr *Walton*, who was one of them, has given us in his IIId *Proleg. to the Polyglott*, both the names and the arguments of moſt of them to his time, who wrote on behalf of the *Samaritan* character. And to his liſt I may now add *Bernard, Blancuccius, Prideaux, Glaſſius, Deylingius, Ric. Simon, Le Clerc*, and *Calmet.*——On the other ſide of the queſtion, are the *two Buxtorf*'s, *Waſmuth, Schickard, Lightfoot*, and *P. Allix.*

Mr *Holloway* hath not told us whoſe writings thoſe were which have been *publiſhed on this argument, only to confound and puzzle the cauſe.* Probably he means much the greateſt part of the learned authors on this ſubject, both ancient and modern, Jews and Chriſtians, who have taken the ſide which he oppoſes: though *Ric. Simon* aſcribes the puzzle and confuſion to the few who have gone into the ſentiment which Mr *Holloway* eſpouſes. —— "*Quelques nouveaux Docteurs qui* "*ſont entêtes de l'Exemplaire Hebreu de* "*Juifs Maſſorites.*"

But I ſhall urge the authority of the writers on this queſtion no further againſt Mr *Holloway*, than he hath urged it in the other queſtion, concerning the Primævity againſt me.

If *Joſ. Scaliger, (that famous Critick* as Mr *Holloway* calls him, See *Remarks*, &c.) having ſaid, "*Epiſt. ad Thompſon,* "*cited by Walton, Summam eſſe imperi-* "*tiam, &c. to fancy the Syriac tongue more* "*ancient than the Hebrew, be enough to* "*lay the ſpirit of Scepticiſm on that point*;" viz. the Primævity. I ſhould hope that the ſame *Joſ. Scaliger* having alſo ſaid in the

the *ſame Epiſtle*, that they who *affirm* the preſent Jewiſh letter to be the old true Hebrew letter are, " *Semidocti, ſemitheo-* " *logi, & (ut ſignantius loquar) ſemihomi-* " *nes*," (I will not add his word ſtill more ſevere) might be enough to lay *the opiniative ſpirit of poſitiveneſs*, in this other point.

SHOULD this expreſſion, though a ſoft one compared with *Scaliger*'s, ſeem rather too ſtrong to be uſed when applied to Mr *Holloway*'s *perſuaſion*, that he is *abſolutely right* in this matter. I deſire it may be interpreted by *his own words*, and it's meaſure not extended beyond what *they* will ſtrictly warrant.

HE ſays, *p.* 25, 26. " *The pretence on* " *the contrary ſuppoſition, is, that the Jews* " *in the Babyloniſh Captivity forgot, and re-* " *linquiſhed their old Hebrew character,* " *which they ſay was that which we now* " *have in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and* " *learned and brought home with them the* " *Chaldee or Aſſyrian character in it's ſtead,* " *as alſo that the Hebrew Scriptures have* " *been ever ſince copied and handed down to* " *us in the ſaid Chaldee character; that* " *pretended old Hebrew character being from*

" *that*

" *that time left to the Samaritans.* NOT " A WORD OF ALL WHICH CAN " POSSIBLY BE TRUE."

THIS, indeed, he tells us *p.* 27. is to be " *Proved at large when he publiſhes the* " *work he intended for Prolegomena to his* " *Originals, but ſhould now make a work by* " *it's ſelf.*"——Yet till ſuch time as his future proofs ſhall appear, and we can reap the benefit of them in a full harveſt, there can be no impropriety in ſifting the firſt fruits that he preſents us with, that we may judge from thence what we are hereafter to expect from him.

SECT.

## SECT. II.

*His firſt proof from* Ezra iv. 7.

HIS foundation is laid, *p.* 23. on *Ezra* iv. 7. viz. the *Samaritans*, " *Practiſing with* Artaxerxes *to put a ſtop* " *to the building of the Temple at* Jeruſalem, " *wrote an epiſtle to this purpoſe to* Arta- " xerxes *in the* Aramitiſh *or* Syriac *writing*, " *as the text expreſſes, and in the* Aramitiſh " *or* Syriac *interpretation*; *that is, in the* " Aramitiſh *or* Syriac, *both character and* " *language*."

AND he remarks, and truly, that *the moſt learned men have explained it thus:* For though the meaning may be as Biſhop *Patrick* obſerves, on the place, that *they ſent a brief addreſs to the King in the* Syrian *tongue, and expounded their buſineſs more largely to ſome of his counſellors, in the ſame tongue*; yet the moſt approved conſtruction

ſtruction is *that* which *the Biſhop* further gives, viz. *that it was wrote*, and *was to be read in the ſame language*, that is, *the Chaldæan*, called in Scripture ארמית.

But what now doth Mr *Holloway* infer from this epiſtle being wrote in the Chaldæan character? Why, he concludes from hence, that it was wrote in what is now called the *Samaritan* character; and then it will follow, that the ſaid *Samaritan* character was the old *Chaldee* character, and conſequently, as he ſays, *p.* 26. the Jews could not unlearn, and relinquiſh the *Samaritan* character, and take the *Chaldee* in it's ſtead, becauſe the *Chaldee* and *Samaritan* were but one and the ſelf ſame character before the *Babyloniſh* Captivity.

Thus his whole argument turns upon this ſingle opinion, that this epiſtle was written according to the alphabet now diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Samaritan*.

I will not ſay, that *not a word of all this can be poſſibly true*; but I will venture to ſay, that Mr *Holloway*, whatever he may ſhew hereafter, in his intended work on this ſubject, hath as yet, (viz. in theſe

*Remarks*)

*Remarks)* ſaid nothing really concluſive towards proving it true.

EZRA. iv. 7. *The writing of the letter was written in the Syrian tongue, and interpreted in the Syrian tongue.* (—Heb. כתוב ארמית ומתרגם ארמית.) Now how doth he infer from hence, that this *Samaritano-Aramitiſh Epiſtle* (as he calls it) though he owns at the ſame time it was wrote in *pure Chaldee*; was written in what we call the *Hebræo-Samaritan* character?

"*THE reaſon*, (ſays he, *p.* 24.) *I* "*ſuppoſe is plain to every body. The* Sa- "maritans, *for the purpoſe, wrote to the* "Perſian *Court, not in the language of the* "*Court, but in that of the country where* "*they were planted, plainly becauſe they* "*were unſkilled in the former, but the latter* "*was their Mother tongue.*"

YET here, if I am capable of making any judgment, inſtead of giving *a reaſon plain to every body*, as *he ſuppoſes*, he aſſerts two things on the authority of two aſſumptions of his own, which will ſatisfy nobody who attends to his argument, and conſiders it as an argument ſaid to be deciſive in this queſtion, viz.

FIRST,

First, That they did not write the epiſtle in the language of the *Perſian* Court, becauſe they were *plainly* unſkilled in that language.

Secondly, That they wrote it in the language of the country where they were planted, becauſe that language was *plainly* their mother tongue.

Let us examine both his aſſertions and aſſumptions.

1. He ſays, *They did not write it in the language of the Perſian Court*, which he afterwards tells us was *Perſic*. But whence hath he this intelligence about the Court language? Or how doth it appear that it was not pure *Chaldee*; the ſame that this letter was wrote in? This had not only been the language of the *Aſſyrian* and *Chaldæan* Monarchs at *Babylon*, (Dan. ii. iii. iv. chap.) but *Darius the Mede*, and his Court ſpoke it. (ibid. chap. vi.) The decree of *Cyrus the Perſian*, (Ezr. vi.) is *Chaldee*. The anſwer to this epiſtle by *Smerdis the Magian*, (called here *Artaxerxes*) and his Court, is *Chaldee*. The anſwer from *Darius Hyſtaſpis*, afterwards to *Tatnai* and *Shethar-boznai*, Ezra v. is *Chaldee:* ſo is the decree of the next *Artaxerxes*,

*xerxes*, granted to *Ezra*.—(chap. vii.) And what reaſon is there to doubt that the language in which the Governors of the provinces wrote to the *Perſian* Kings, and in which the reſcripts of the Kings were ſent to the Governors,—was the language of the *Perſian* Court?

2. *PLAINLY*, ſays Mr *Holloway*, *becauſe they*, (the *Samaritans*) *were unſkilled in that language*, viz. *Perſic*.——Now had the language of the Court really been *Perſic*, and as ſuch not intelligible to the ordinary *Samaritans*, doth it follow that they who indited this epiſtle, and wrote it, viz. *Rehum* the Chancellor, and *Shimſhai* the Scribe, (ver. 8, and 9.) perſons in office and authority, who managed the affairs of this colony under the *Perſian* Kings, were unſkilled in the language of the Court? They might be ſuppoſed to underſtand what the bulk of that mongrel people did not, as in the inſtance quoted by Mr *Holloway* himſelf, *p.* 23. of *Rabſhakeh* underſtanding Hebrew, and of *Hezekiah*'s miniſters underſtanding *Chaldee*, though *the men on the wall* knew only their native language.

BUT if the language of the Court was not *Perſic*, (and the preſumption will lie on that ſide, for the reaſons abovementioned, till ſome better reaſons are alledged to the contrary) then both the aſſertion and aſſumption fall together.

3. "*THIS epiſtle*, he ſays, *was wrote* "*in the language of the country where they* "(the *Samaritans) were planted.*" — The ſtile of the epiſtle is confeſſed to be *pure Chaldee*; and how doth it appear that this was their language in the land of *Iſrael*, where they had been ſettled ſo many years? For though the *Chaldee* might have been the former language of the *Cuthites*, *Dinaites*, &c. (*Ezra* iv. 9.) their anceſtors while they dwelt in *Cutha*, *Ava*, *Hamath*, &c. (2 *Kings* xvii. 24.) yet upon their removal into *Canaan*, by their mixture and converſation with the ſmall remains of the *Iſraelites*, and by correſpondence with their neighbours the *Jews* and *Phenicians*, it might have been changed, (as it is ſuppoſed to have been) in the ſpace of 150 years, (for ſo long it was from their being tranſplanted by *Aſnapper*, or *Eſar-haddon*, into the cities of *Samaria*, Ezra iv. 10. — to the writing this epiſtle) and

and might have become by that means a medley of *Hebrew*, or *Phenician* and *Chaldee*; and be called (by the name they acquired themſelves afterwards) *Samaritan*, or *Samaritano-Aramitiſh*. And the ordinary people, whoſe vernacular tongue was the *Samaritan*, might underſtand pure *Chaldee* little better than they did *Perſic*: though the writers of the letter may be ſuppoſed, as is ſaid above, to have underſtood *Chaldee*, as it was the language of the Court under which they adminiſtered. When therefore Mr *Holloway* tells us,

4. THAT *Chaldee* was *their Mother-tongue*, if that expreſſion be meant of the dialect of the country where they then dwelt, taken from their immediate progenitors, their language muſt be *Samaritan*, as diſtinguiſhed from pure *Chaldee*. But, if by *Mother-tongue* be meant the language of their forefathers in the land of *Aſſyria*, then they did not write this epiſtle in the language of the country where they were planted:——In either caſe the aſſumption will not ſupport the aſſertion.

BUT now ſuppoſe Mr *Holloway* had been undoubtedly right in all theſe four points, concerning the language of the

epiſtle, muſt it follow that it was wrote in *the preſent* Samaritan character? This is the important inference he would eſtabliſh as certain, becauſe the text in *Ezra* is expreſs, that they wrote in the *Chaldee* or *Syrian* character, as well as in the *Chaldee* or *Syrian* language. But might not their alphabet be changed, though their language remained the ſame? and if they had changed their alphabet, and wrote in that which was in uſe in *Canaan*, might there not be good reaſon, why, in writing to the *Perſian* Court, they ſhould rather uſe the old character of their language, well known at Court, than uſe the new character, they had borrowed from their neighbours in the land of *Iſrael?*

LANGUAGES and their original and proper alphabets do not always go together. Both the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* in Scripture, are wrote according to the ſelf ſame alphabet, and conſequently, one or other of them in a character not properly it's own. Upon Mr *Holloway*'s own ſuppoſition, not only all the *Chaldee* in the Bible, and the *Targums* upon it, are wrote in a character not belonging to the *Chaldee* language; but the Hebrew Pentateuch itſelf

ſelf in the *Hebræo-Samaritan* text, muſt be wrote in the true *Aramitiſh* or *Chaldee* character. And we are told of *Arabic* verſions wrote both in the *Syriac*, *Perſic*, and *Samaritan* characters; nay even of printed editions of *Arabic* Bibles in *Hebrew* letters. The firſt edition of the *Pentateuch* in *Perſic* was in *Hebrew* characters, publiſhed at *Conſtantinople*: And there are ſeveral editions of the *Syriac* New Teſtament in *Hebrew* letters. See *Le Long*'s *Bibliotheca Sacra*. So that I apprehend nothing can be proved from his argument to ſhew that the *Samaritans* might not have a character which they uſed in *Canaan*, (after dwelling there a century and half) different from what they had formerly uſed themſelves, and from what was yet uſed in other countries, where the *Chaldee* was ordinarily ſpoke. And ſuppoſing them to have taken the Hebrew letter into uſage, it is not likely they ſhould write in that character borrowed from the Hebrews, when they were drawing up an accuſation againſt them to the King, on purpoſe to render them ſuſpected and odious to him: becauſe every ſpecies of commerce with them, or communication

of cuſtoms, was to be imprudence, deſignedly concealed on this occaſion.

All this, I ſay, might be alledged on Mr *Holloway*'s own ſuppoſition, that their country tongue was pure *Chaldee*, like their epiſtle. But the moſt natural account, nevertheleſs, ſeems to be that ארמית in the text, is neither meant of their own proper language, nor of their own proper alphabet: but only, that whereas they had changed their language in part, and their character altogether, by taking that of *Canaan* in it's ſtead,——when their Governors, the Chancellor, and Secretary wrote to the King, they neither made uſe of the *Samaritan* character, or their dialect, but wrote in the language of the Court, viz. pure *Chaldee*, and in the proper *Chaldee* character or letter; for otherwiſe, why ſhould the Hiſtorian have been ſo unuſually circumſtantial, in ſpeaking of the character as well as language, in which this epiſtle from the *Samaritans* was written?

But Mr *Holloway* obſerves from *Eſther* i. 22. and viii. 9. that "*It was the cuſtom* "*of the ſaid Court to write to the Provinces* "*of their Empire, not in their own* Perſic, "*but*

" *but in the language and alphabet of each* " *Province.*"——Yet this will determine nothing about either the language or alphabet of the *Samaritans*. For as their epiſtle was wrote to the Court in the *Aramitiſh* language and character, it was anſwered, according to Mr *Holloway*'s own rule, both in the ſame language and alphabet. And as the language of the reſcript is allowed to be ארמית, or pure *Chaldee*, ſo, for any thing yet ſhewn, or perhaps that can be ſhewn to the contrary, it might be wrote in that ſquare letter, or nearly the ſame, in which it now appears in the Jewiſh copies of the Bible.

And now, if theſe Chiefs of the *Samaritans* may, (for the reaſons abovementioned, or for any other reaſons that cannot be now diſcovered) without any great abſurdity or incongruity, be ſuppoſed to have wrote their epiſtle in what is called, and known commonly by the name of the *Chaldee*, now *Hebrew* character; and the *Perſian* Court may be ſuppoſed to have replied to them in the ſame character, as well as language; in a word, if כתוב ארמית in this text of *Ezra*, may be ſuppoſed to mean, or *even may poſſibly*

*mean*, the ſquare letter in which the *Jews* have for ſeveral ages wrote Hebrew; then there is an end of Mr *Holloway*'s DEMONSTRATION: For all that he ſaith afterwards, is entirely built on a perſuaſion that this *cannot be true*, and that he himſelf is *abſolutely right in affirming* that the *Samaritans* and *Chaldeans muſt have one and the ſame, not only language, but alphabet alſo.*

"*IT muſt have been ſo*, (he ſays) *from* "*ancient times, at leaſt from the planting* "*that mongrel people in the land of* Iſrael." —Remarks.

BUT it was after the planting them there, that the alphabets are ſuppoſed to have been changed.—"*Since which their* "*alphabet hath undergone little, or no ma-*"*terial change.*" Ibid.

BUT the whole change made in their alphabet, is thought to have been made after their being planted there.—"*And* "*as to what it was before we know nothing.*" Ibid. Here then, Mr *Holloway* muſt be *content with his ignorance*, while others conceive, and upon good grounds, that their alphabet before this change was the *Aramitiſh* or *Chaldee*, now commonly called

called the Hebrew. " *But we are to ſup-*
" *poſe, that from the time the* Aramites, Aſ-
" ſyrians, *and* Chaldeans, *(whoſe peculium*
" *it was) had an alphabet; it muſt have*
" *been the ſame in the main that is ſtill pre-*
" *ſerved in the* Samaritan *Pentateuch.*" Ibid. We have no reaſon to ſuppoſe any ſuch thing, but great reaſon to believe the contrary, " *Seeing this is allowed to be the*
" *character the* Samaritans *always uſed:*" ibid. allowed only to be the character they uſed before they were planted in *Samaria*, or their character as *Cuthites*, which they formerly held in common with the *Aramites*; " *And what they ſo uſed, (as has*
" *been now proved again and again, by a*
" *connexion of evidence that cannot be ſe-*
" *parated) was the ſame with the ſaid* Ara-
" mitiſh, Chaldean, *&c.*" This hath, indeed, been *ſaid* again, and again, on a preſumption of facts, which ought to be ſeparated from evidence, as not having any neceſſary connexion with truth. But if *ſaying* be *proving*, there will be more proof ſtill. " *For even in the time of* Ezra *it had*
" *not obtained any name of it's own, but*
" *was called by that which was it's old name,*
" *viz. the* Aramitiſh, *which I muſt again*
" *repeat*

" *repeat, (leſt ſome readers, willingly for-*
" *getful, ſhould let it ſlip) was alſo the* Chal-
" dean, Aſſyrian, *&c.*" But the reader muſt be forgetful, indeed, if he lets ſlip what has been aboveſaid, that although the *Aramitiſh*, or *Aſſyrian* character may have been one and the ſame with the *Chaldee*; yet that the *Samaritan* may nevertheleſs mean the old *Hebrew*, or *Phenician* character.

Now comes the grand inference, or proof of a *point much wanted by the learned world.* —— " *The matter I mean* (ſays he)
" *is that AS the ſaid* Samaritan *character*
" *ſtill preſerved in the* Samaritan *Pentateuch,*
" *is no other than the ſaid old* Aramitiſh,
" *or* Syriac, *and* Chaldee *character, SO*
" *IT MUST from hence follow, that the*
" Samaritan *alphabet, or character, could*
" *never be the character or alphabet in which*
" *the ſacred Hebrew Scriptures of the* Old
" Teſtament *were written.*" Remarks, *p.* 25.

But *as* he hath not yet proved the premiſes, *ſo it muſt from hence follow*, that his concluſion, though otherwiſe juſtly drawn, has no right to be admitted: and conſequently, the contrary ſuppoſition, of which

which he is pleaſed to ſay, (*p.* 26.) *not a word can poſſibly be true*; may be true for any thing that hath yet appeared from his reaſonings againſt it. " *The Jews* (he " ſays) *could not unlearn and relinquiſh the* " Samaritan *character and take the* Chal- " dee *in it's ſtead, becauſe the* Chaldee *and* " Samaritan *were but one and the ſelf ſame* " *character before the Babyloniſh Captivity.*" (This is begging his premiſes) " *Which* " *ſaid one was never confounded in name* " *with the Hebrew, but was ſtill diſtin-* " *guiſhed from it by another different name,* " *viz. the* Aramitiſh." *Ibid.*— Right, if the premiſes be granted. But if the *Samaritan* and the *Chaldee* characters are two different characters, not one and the ſelf ſame, then it will be juſtly ſaid, that the ſaid *Samaritan*, though *not confounded now* in *name with the Hebrew*, might have been once the very *Hebrew* character; and the *Chaldee* character, though now confounded in name with the Hebrew, might have been anciently diſtinguiſhed from the Hebrew by another different name, viz. the *Aramitiſh.*

" *AND therefore, if the Jews ever had* " *relinquiſhed any more ancient character,*

" *it*

" *it muſt have been ſome character of which* " *we now know nothing.*" Ibid.——Right again upon his hypotheſis, which makes an *exit* here in an argument *ad ignorantiam:* which, though he be content with it, finds no place in the contrary ſuppoſition; for if the Jews could relinquiſh their character at all, there will be little doubt remaining what character it was for which they relinquiſhed it.

" *AND if they had taken the* Chaldee, " *they could not have taken the preſent He-* " *brew, which the* Chaldeans *never had,* " *but muſt of neceſſity have taken the preſent* " Samaritan." ibid.——But it is both as intelligible and as true when put thus—— And if they had taken *Chaldee*, they could not have taken any other than the preſent Hebrew, which was the character the *Chaldeans* had; and *of neceſſity* they could not take the preſent *Samaritan*, becauſe it is the character that they relinquiſhed.

" *AND ſo in this* Samaritan, *and not* " *the preſent Hebrew, the Hebrew Scrip-* " *tures ſhould have been handed down by* " *them to poſterity, and we ſhould now have* " *the Hebrew Scriptures accordingly, not in* " *the preſent Hebrew, but in that ſaid* Sa-

" maritan

" maritan *character*; *the* Chaldee *character*
" *which they muſt have brought home from*
" Babylon *(had they brought home* that) *be-*
" *ing, as I have demonſtrated, all one and*
" *the ſame with the* Syrian *or* Aramitiſh;
" *and therefore alſo with the ſaid* Samari-
" tan." ibid. *p.* 27.

THAT the *Chaldee* character might be the ſame with the *Syrian* or *Aramitiſh* was never, that I know of, denied, and ſo needed not to be *demonſtrated:* but that it ſhould *therefore* be the ſame with the *Samaritan* alſo, will really need *a demonſtration*, or ſome cogent proof before it can be admitted.

" *AGAIN. As the* Samaritans, Ara-
" mites, *and* Chaldeans *had all the ſame*
" *character with one another, ſo according*
" *to* Walton, Scaliger, *and other learned*
" *men, the old* Phenicians, *and* Canaanites,
" *had in like manner the ſame with them:*
" *and ſo all thoſe nations had one and the*
" *ſame character, viz. the* Aramitiſh,
" Chaldean, *or* Samaritan." ibid. *Walton, Scaliger*, and other learned men have ſuppoſed the old *Phenicians* and *Canaanites* had the ſame character with the *Samaritans*; but not the ſame with the *Aramites*

and

and *Chaldeans*. This laſt opinion is *only according to Mr* Holloway, in which *Walton*, *Scaliger*, and other learned men, are entirely againſt him.

"*CONSEQUENTLY ſaying the* "*Jews changed the old Hebrew (by that* "*Hebrew meaning the* Samaritan) *for the* "Chaldee, *is ſaying they changed the* Chal- "dee *for itſelf.*" ibid. To whom can ſuch a ſolœciſm belong, but to one who will have the *Chaldee* and *Samaritan* characters, at all adventures, to be *one* and the *ſame*?

"*BESIDES all which, as to this* "*pretended change of the letters, there are* "*yet other proofs to be drawn from the book* "*of* Ezra *itſelf, that* Ezra *made no change* "*of the ancient Hebrew character for any* "*other; but that he delivered down the* "*Scriptures as they had been delivered from* "Moſes, *and all the Prophets following,* "*down to himſelf.*" ibid.—I ſhould have ſaid ſomething to this too, had not Mr *Holloway* immediately added —— "*As I* "*ſhall prove at large, if God gives me life* "*and leiſure to publiſh the work I intend-* "*ed for* Prolegomena *to my* Originals :—— "*I mean, if the love of the Scriptures*

"*ſhould*

" *ſhould diſpoſe the Literati to encourage ſuch* " *works.*"

ALL therefore I have to ſay in reply here, and it comes from me with greater pleaſure than any thing I have now written on the former articles, is,——That I heartily wiſh him life and leiſure to finiſh and publiſh what he intends: And that he may do it not only to his own ſatisfaction, but to the ſatisfaction alſo of the *Literati:* Whom I cannot think, as he ſeems to do, diſinclined to *encourage ſuch works*, if by that expreſſion he means not to preclude them from the liberty of examining, diſapproving, or even confuting ſuch works as they ſhall ſee occaſion. For the ſame love of the Scriptures which diſpoſes them to encourage the publication of every well meant undertaking in the cauſe of truth, will equally prompt them to oppoſe error, and rectify miſtakes wherever they find them.

SECT.

## SECT. III.

*What he ſays of the* Samaritan *Shekels, conſidered.*

MR *Holloway* proceeds next, *Remarks*, p. 28. to ſhew that the *Aramitiſh* or *Syrian* did alſo comprehend the *Arabian* tongue. Upon which he quotes *the Additament inſerted by the* LXX, *at the end of the Book of* Job, *expreſſing, that it was tranſlated out of the* Syrian, *in the borders of* Idumæa *and* Arabia. What he obſerves from hence, and from Biſhop *Maximinus*'s explanation of this paſſage, *p.* 29. and upon *that very odd note*, as he calls it, in the *Scholiaſt* on this paſſage of the LXX, marked by *Flam. Nobilius*, p. 29, 30.——I paſs entirely over, becauſe this additament hath been thoroughly conſidered, and accounted for by Dr *Pocock*, in his Preface to his Commentary

on

on *Micah*, to which I refer my reader, if he thinks it to be of any concernment: and I ſhall only take notice of what immediately belongs to the ſubject in hand, in Mr *Holloway*'s paragraph about the *Shekels*, *Remarks*, p. 30, 31. in the following words,

" *BUT there is another objection ſtill* " *behind, againſt the primævity of the He-* " *brew character, which the diffuſe ſort of* " *writers hold to be unanſwerable: I mean* " *that taken from the famous* Samaritan *She-* " *kels. But this with believers, will not be* " *admitted againſt proofs brought from the* " *Scriptures, but will, where ſuch are pro-* " *duced, be rejected without more ado, as* " *things forged or ſpurious, or never yet* " *brought to the true critical teſt.*"

THE *true teſt*, I preſume, which is here referred to, is Mr *Holloway*'s text from *Ezra*, *as by himſelf explained*, in a manner never yet thought of by the writers *de Siclis*; (whom he repreſents, at leaſt as many as are againſt him, as a *diffuſe ſort of writers*, ex. gr.—*Poſtell*, *Gerh. Voſſius*, *Walton*, *Morin*, *Prideaux* *, and

 ſuch

* Beſides thoſe mentioned in *Walton*, and *Ric. Simon*, we

ſuch like) whereby it will appear that the *Samaritan Shekel* hath an inſcription in the *Aſſyrian* or *Chaldean* character, inſtead of the old *Hebrew* character: Or is ſtamped according to the true *Syrian* or *Aramitiſh* alphabet, and not with the true *Hebrew* letter. And therefore ſuch as are pretended to have been ſtruck before the *Babyloniſh* Captivity with the *Samaritan* character, muſt of neceſſity be forged and ſpurious.

But may not the authority of this *critical teſt* be queſtioned, before it is acknowledged? Nothing indeed will, or ought *to be admitted by believers againſt proofs brought from the Scriptures.* But are they to take Mr *Holloway*'s conſtruction of the Scriptures for undoubted proof, and *reject, without more ado*, what is not genuine by his teſt? *Proofs produced*, unleſs they are pertinent when produced, (and perhaps thoſe brought by him may not, after examination be thought ſo) will avail nothing towards

we may reckon on the ſame ſide *Kircher, Scacchus, Wagenſeil, Adricomius, Maſius*, &c. And on the other ſide, *Otho Sperlingius, Reland, Hottinger, Baſnage*, &c. Vide *Deylingium* de Re nummariâ veterum Hebræorum. Part III. p. 175.

towards ſetting aſide what ſeems already eſtabliſhed on good grounds.

" *AND, indeed,* (ſays he) *ſeveral ſuf-*
" *ficient arguments have been already offered*
" *againſt theſe trinkets by learned men: to*
" *which, if ever print the work above-*
" *mentioned, I ſhall add others, ſufficient I*
" *hope to put an end to this diſpute.*"

WHAT he will make out on this controverted point, time muſt ſhew. But I believe we ſhould not flatter ourſelves with the expectation of having any thing *demonſtrated, by a connexion of evidence not to be ſeparated*; though he may, perhaps, be able to ſhew that ſome of the writers on the other ſide have expreſſed themſelves too poſitively, and peremptorily on the occaſion *; and *have held their arguments*, as he obſerves, *to be unanſwerable:* a fault which we may ſometimes diſcern even in

 great

* Mr *Holloway*'s *famous critic*, Joſ. Scaliger, ſays on this ſubject, not only *ſummam eſſe imperitiam*, &c. as above noted, but *Extremæ inſaniæ & imperitiæ eſt putare veterum Hebræorum alias literas fuiſſe quam quæ in illis Siclis viſuntur.*

And *Walton*, *Ductum ex antiquis Siclis & numiſmatis Hebræorum argumentum ante captivitatem cuſis——Cui nemo niſi qui luſcus vel oculos claudit aſſentiri non poſſit.*——Proleg. III.

great men, ſpeaking on favourite points, which will not altogether warrant ſuch confidence.

WHOSOEVER carefully peruſes what Baron *Spanheim* has ſaid upon the *Shekels*, (and he had ſeen the choiceſt of them in the beſt cabinets) will have reaſon to diſtruſt the truth of ſome extraordinary inferences from them, which nevertheleſs have been given out as certain and indubitable. And I may add the judgment alſo of another great man, viz. the late Biſhop *Hooper*, in his *Enquiry into the ſtate of the ancient meaſures*, &c. p. 251. which is not ſo favourable for the genuineneſs of the Shekels before the Captivity, as the learned ſuffrage of the laſt age was. (Though neither *he* nor *Spanheim* call them *trinkets.)* So that I ſhould not wonder if ſome curious readers on this queſtion, on both ſides, ſhould think and ſay of it at length, as *Erpenius* ſaid of the other diſpute, *Whether Hebrew or Syriac was the firſt language*, viz. *litem eſſe adhuc ſub judice.* And ſo I am apt to think it is likely to remain till Mr *Holloway prints his work abovementioned*,

*mentioned*, and *puts an end to the diſpute*: if ſo be theſe two events may haply fall out together.

LET him only propoſe his own doubts concerning the ſuppoſed authority of theſe *Shekels*, with the ſame modeſty and deference that *Spanheim* has uſed, and treat the arguments of thoſe who think not as he doth, with the ſame temper and moderation; and then what he ſhall advance, however new or uncommon, if ſupported only with probable teſtimony, will, no doubt, be acceptable to the Learned, and will do credit to himſelf, whether it will have any further effect or not.

IN the mean time I conclude this article in the words of Dr *Prideaux*. *Conn.* Vol. I. p. 272. fol.

"THERE are ſome who ſtrenuouſly "contend for the antiquity of the pre- "ſent Hebrew letters, as if they, and "none other, had been always the ſa- "cred character in which the Holy "Scriptures were written. And that "the *Samaritan* was never in uſe for "this purpoſe:——But the opinion of

" the moſt learned men, and upon " good grounds, is on the other ſide. " —— And I think" (ſays he, for ſo he concludes) " the argument which is " brought from the *Shekels* cannot be " anſwered."

SECT.

## SECT. IV.

*Mr* Holloway's *argument from the diſtinction between* Aſhurit *and* Hibrit, *conſidered.*

BUT the learned author has opened another ſcene upon the ſame ſubject, and hath given us a Key, which, if it anſwers his opinion of it, will let us into an eaſy ſolution of this intricate, and much controverted queſtion.

FOR in *p.* 95. of his *Primævity of the Sacred Hebrew*, he ſays, " *I will add here* " *a ſhort note of ſome of the particulars,* " *which I think occaſioned the whole miſtake* " *that has gone abroad concerning the change* " *pretended to have been made by* Ezra, of " *the ſuppoſed old Hebrew character, for that* " *called the Chaldee.*"

WHEREBY, among other benefits to be reaped by this diſcovery (ſee the note at the bottom of the ſame page) —— " *We*

" *ſhall be able to account for the* Samaritan
" *Shekels being ſtruck with the* Chaldee *cha-*
" *racter they now bear, (ſuppoſing any of*
" *them to be ancient) without that expedient*
" *of reverſing the two alphabets, commonly*
" *taken by modern criticks.*"

AND this whole matter he conceives may be preſently ſet right, if we will carefully attend to the old diſtinction between *Aſhurît* and *Hibrit*, as applied to *characters* or *alphabets*.

HE ſtates the diſtinction thus.

" THE two words *Aſhurît* and *Hibrit*
" have had diverſe and mixed applications
" among the *Jews*; the *former* ſignifying,
" as a *Gentile* and *proper adjective*, *Aſſyrian*;
" as an appellative, the *bleſſed*, or *ſacred*;
" and ſo when applied to language, the
" *ſacred tongue*, and *character*. And the
" *latter* (now the ſacred *Hebrew*) being
" anciently put for the *Tranſfluvial* or
" *Hebrew* brought *from beyond the River*.
" And under theſe ſeveral names, the
" *Jews* had of old two ſeveral alphabets,
" viz. the ſaid *Aſhurît*, or ſacred, in which
" the Law was originally written by *Moſes*,
" and in which the Holy Scriptures con-
" tinued to be written for ſacred and

" temple

" temple uſes ever after: and the *Tranſ-*
" *fluvial*, which was uſed by all the *Ara-*
" *mitiſh* nations, and by the ancient *Jews*
" alſo, in common and civil affairs, as for
" *inſcriptions* on their *coins*, *contracts*, *epi-*
" *ſtolary writing*, and even to copy the
" Scriptures for private uſe. By which
" means that which is now called *Hebrew*,
" had then the title of *Aſhurît*, and that
" which was then termed *Hebrew*, in that
" ſenſe of *Transfluvial* (which was indeed
" the *Aramitiſh*) was afterwards called the
" *Samaritan*; from the people of *Samaria*,
" (a mixt colony of *Chaldæans*, *Aſſyrians*,
" &c.) who had copied the books of the
" Law in it. And theſe things thus ob-
" tained chiefly till after the *Babyloniſh*
" *Captivity*."

In the manner in which theſe ſeveral points are laid together they have a fair appearance, and ſeem to reconcile the difference among other writers about the Jewiſh alphabet. But whence hath Mr *Holloway* this diſtinction, and all this intelligence concerning it? He ſcruples not to own that he has them from thoſe Rabbinical Writings, which he doth at other times deſpiſe and explode.

Should

SHOULD any one alledge the teſtimony, or traditions of the Rabbins againſt any of his *own* concluſions, He would perhaps think it ſufficient to anſwer, that theſe apoſtates are not to be credited in any thing they ſay: that we are not to truſt them in any of their readings, punctuations, and conſtructions of the Sacred Text, by which they endeavour to blind us, and lead us from the truth. But now that they ſeem to have ſpoken ſomething concerning the Hebrew alphabet that correſponds with his own notions, they ſtand, on this occaſion, better in his opinion.

*VOISIN* and *Buxtorf*, to whom he refers at the end of this note, the former in his obſervations on the *Proœm.* to *Martin*'s *Pugio Fidei*, and the other in his diſſertation *de literarum Hebraicarum genuinâ Antiquitate*; have brought together a number of paſſages out of both the *Talmuds*, and other Rabbinical books, in which this diſtinction is mentioned, and in which the reader will find it explicated with great variety of ſentiments, and no ſmall trifling in argumentation. But I ſhall content myſelf with only making a few

few Remarks upon what Mr *Holloway* has taken from them, or advanced upon them.

——"*THE two words* Aſhurît *and* "Hibri *have had diverſe and mixt applica-* "*tions among the* Jews."

VERY true, and for that reaſon neither the Jews tradition, nor their judgment in ſupporting it, are to be in any wiſe depended upon. Whatever weight their teſtimony may be ſuppoſed to have in other caſes, it ought to have little in this, becauſe they differ from each other in almoſt every article of the queſtion. *Diverſas ferunt ſententias in Talmude*, ſays *Voiſin*, p. 105. And leſt this difference in opinion ſhould ſeem to have ariſen from ſingularity and petulance in Rabbins of leſſer note, I ſhould further obſerve with *Buxtorf*, *(Lex. Chal. Tal. in voce Aſhurît) In utramque ſententiam apud Hebræos ſunt graves autores.*

——"*THE former* (viz. Aſhurît) *ſig-* "*nifying as a gentile and proper adjective*, "Aſſyrian, *as an appellative, the* bleſſed *or* "ſacred."——

BUT how do the Rabbins themſelves explain this term?

THEY

THEY who expound it as an appellative, do not expound it by *ſacred*, though they allow the character to be ſacred in conſequence * of it's being the ſame which, they ſay, God uſed when he wrote the Decalogue; but they tell us it was called Aſhurît אשורית, either becauſe it was מאושרת בכתב *beatificata in ſcriptione* †; or becauſe it was המאושר, or מיושרת באותיותיה *recta in literis ſuis* ‡. (And ſo *Lightfoot* renders it, *bleſſed* or *direct.*) Or becauſe it was *grand* §, *beautiful*, *decent*, *elegant*, &c. While others among them interpret it altogether as *a gentile adjective*, and ſay it means no more than ‖ *Aſſyrian*. And the Grammarian *Abraham de Balmis*, expounds the term in all theſe ſenſes, according to *Buxtorf*'s verſion,

* Auctor *En Iſrael.* Vide *Voiſin*, p. 105.

† *R. Judah Haccadoſh. Voiſ.* ibid. *Buxt.* Theſes 14. & 20.

‡ *R. Ephodeus & Abra. de Balmis.* Buxt. Theſis, 20.

§ *Aſchuri*, propter *magnificentiam & decorem*, ex ſignificatione illâ verbi *Aſchar* quâ legimus, *Gen.* xxx. 13.—— *Rambam.* Vide *Buxt.* Theſis, 20.

‖ Cur vocatur *Aſſurît?* Quia aſcendit cum eis מאשור ex *Aſſyriâ*. *Rab. Joſe. Buxt.* Theſis, 42.

Vocarunt autem eam Aſſyriam quia magnates Iſraelis eam ſecum ferebant מארץ אשור. *R. Gedaliah.* Theſis, 44.

verſion, *viz. Aſhurit quæ eſt rectiſſima*, & *beatiſſima* in literis ſuis, & exivit nobiſcum ex *Aſſyria*. *Theſis* 20.

" *AND ſo when applied to language*, " *the ſacred* tongue *and character:*"—— *Primævity*, *ibid.*

VERY rarely is it thus applied to the Hebrew language by the Rabbins, ſo far as I have obſerved, (an inſtance or two are found in *Buxtorf*'s Lex. Rabbin. which may be accounted for) and it is never applied as an appellative, to any other language; none being called *bleſſed* or *ſacred* but that in which the Scriptures were wrote. And though it ſeems to be as proper a *gentile adjective* for the *Aſſyrian* language as *Aramith* is, yet I queſtion whether it is ſo uſed. It was a miſtake that *Lightfoot* ſlipped into, when he tranſlated the words of *Rab. Judah*, (Vol. II. p. 138.) *The Law was given in the* Aſſyrian language—for the words that follow are —" *And when they ſinned it was turned* " into *breaking*," (viz. another manner of writing, as hereafter will be explained) " *and when they were worthy in the days of* " Ezra, *it was turned for them again into* " Aſſyrian." This plainly relates to the *character*,

*character*, not to the *language*. And *Buxtorf* citing another author who had ſaid *Ab Initio, duæ Linguæ, externa & ſacra*, &c. amends the error by adding——vult dicere *Scripturæ*. *Theſ.* xlv.

——" *AND the latter* [*now the ſacred* " *Hebrew*] *being anciently put for the* " *Transfluvial, or Hebrew brought from be-* " *yond the river.*" *Primævity, ibid.*

*HIBRI*, indeed, is uſed both of language and character. Yet it is rarely, if ever, uſed otherwiſe than of the tongue and writing of the *Jews*. Even when the character was ſaid to be *Aſhurît*, the language nevertheleſs was *Hibri*; ſo that the ſame copies muſt have been both *Aſhurît* and *Hibri*, the one in regard of the character, the other in reſpect of the language. So Rab. *Eliezer Hakkelir*, בכתב אשורית ובלשון עברית in the *Aſſurit* writing and *Hibrit* tongue. *Buxt.* Theſis, 15. But when Mr *Holloway* gives us the ſignification of *Hibri*, as being anciently put for the *Transfluvial*, or Hebrew brought from beyond the River, he applies it to *an alphabet*, in that ſenſe in which it was only uſed with propriety of the *Hebrew* people, as deſcending from *Abraham*:

*Abraham:* For whether *Abraham* were called *Hebrew* becauſe he came from the *other ſide of the Flood*, or by reaſon of his being deſcended from *Heber*, *the language* and *character* uſed by his progeny were not denominated *Hibri* from being *themſelves transfluvial* alſo, or derived from *Heber*, but from being the language and writing of the *Hebrew* nation, while they dwelt in *Canaan*. Neither do I know whether Mr *Holloway* will admit that there was writing, or alphabets of any kind before *Moſes*. However, I make this diſtinction here to obviate the uſes he preſently makes of the term *Transfluvial* alphabet, or character brought from beyond the River.

——" *AND under theſe ſeveral names* " *the Jews had of old two ſeveral alphabets.*"

HERE he begins to infer from his premiſes, and muſt be the more carefully attended to. By the Jews having *theſe two alphabets of old*, he means, as appears from what follows, their having them from the time of *Moſes*, till after the *Babyloniſh* Captivity; for it was within *that* period, that *things thus obtained chiefly*, as he afterwards words it.—" Viz. *The ſaid* Aſhurit,

*or*

" *or* Sacred, *in which the Law was origi-*
" *nally written by* Moſes, *and in which the*
" Holy Scriptures *continued to be written*
" *for* Sacred and Temple-uſes *ever after.*"

THE Rabbins, he ſuppoſes, have given an account of this *in ſubſtance, as he has collected it*, p. 97. And he remits the reader to the citations made from them by *Voiſin* and *Buxtorf*, &c.

LET us then attend to the account the Rabbins have given according to theſe authors.

IN the book *En Iſrael, ad cap.* 1. *Tract. Talmud Megilah*, cited by *Voiſin*, p. 105. and by *Buxt. Theſes*, 68, and 70. We are told that this *Aſhurit* character was not known to any nation but the *Iſraelites*, who learned it from the writing on the Tables, and in the book of the Law depoſited in the Ark. Neither did the vulgar underſtand it, or the *Iſraelites* generally, but only יחיד בדור *One in a generation*, ſuch as *Daniel*, who by his knowledge of it interpreted the hand-writing on the wall of *Belſhazzar*'s palace, which was wrote by an angel in this extraordinary character. That *Daniel* afterwards taught the *Chaldean* Princes and Nobles how

how to read and uſe it, and that *Ezra* taught it the Jews.

But the great Rabbi *Judah Haccadoſh* ſays, that "Tho' the Law in the begin-"ning was given in *Aſhurit* writing, yet for "the ſins of the people נהפך להן לרועץ "*converſa eſt ipſis* in fracturam:" It was changed into a *broken* or *disjoined* character; by which (though there are diſputes about the words *) he is here ſuppoſed to mean the character now called *Samaritan*. "But, ſays he, when the "*Iſraelites* repented, God reſtored the "*Aſhurit* writing to them in the time of "*Ezra*." *Buxt. Theſ.* 14.

And this is proved in the following manner from Scripture, *Deut.* xvii. 18. *He* (the King) *ſhall write him a copy* (or duplicate משנה) *of this Law in a book*:— i. e. ſays the Rabbi, as interpreted by *Lightfoot*, in a writing *that was to be changed*: Or, as *Buxtorf* renders it "משנה "*dupla* vel *ſecundana*, quod ejus Scriptura

* De quorum verborum ſenſu variè diſputant Hebræi, ut videre eſt apud *Aſariam* in *Meor Enajim*. c. 56. Omnes tamen in hoc conveniunt ſignificari hâc phraſi vel *oblivionem* vel *mutationem* Scripturæ illius priſcæ in quâ Lex data fuit. *Buxt. Theſ.* 14.

" *mutari* vel *iterari* & *ſecundâ vice dari* " *debuerit*." *Theſ.* 69.

BUT when the *Iſraelites* returned to God by repentance, *then* ſays the *Rabbi* " God reſtored to them *Aſhurit*, accord- " ing to *Zech.* ix. 12. To day I declare " that I will render *double* unto thee, viz. " משנה the *doubled* or *ſeconded* (as *Light-* " *foot* words it,) q. d. *Pro eo quod oblitus* " *fueras Scripturarum* dupli *ſive* exempla- " ris legis, *reſtituam tibi id cujus oblitus* " *fueras*; vel hoc ſenſu, reſtituam tibi " *mutatam* Scripturam legis," as *Buxt.* explains it. Theſ. 14.

BUT what ſay other Rabbins? Why *Mar Sutra* (quoted by *Voiſin*, p. 105, and by *Buxt.* Theſ. 43.) ſays that " In the " beginning the Law was given in *Hibri* " writing, and the Holy Tongue, but in " the days of *Ezra* in *Aſhurit* writing, " and *Chaldee* tongue;——that the Jews " choſe to themſelves the *Aſſurit* cha- " racter, and holy *Hebrew* tongue, and " left the *Hebrew* character, with the " *Chaldee* tongue, to the *Samaritans*."

" THE Law (ſays another *Rabbi*, (*Buxt. Theſ.* 42.) " was given in *Raaz*, ברעז נתנה תורה that is, as interpreters take

" take it, in the *Samaritan* character, or " that alphabet into which Rab. *Judah*, " had ſaid the *Aſhurit* was changed for " the ſins of the people. And the term " *Raaz* is uſed by both of them in pro- " per diſtinction from *Aſhurit*, when ap- " plied to alphabets, whereas *Hibri*, which " relates to language as well as alphabet, " ſeemeth not ſo proper."

MR *Holloway* having mentioned the *Aſhurit* for Temple uſes, proceeds—— " *And the Transfluvial which was uſed by* " *all the* Aramitiſh *nations.*" *(Primævity, ibid.)*

THE book *En Iſrael*, in *Voiſin*, p. 87, and 106. ſays the character was called *Ibri*, as being anciently uſed by the people beyond the river. Yet as the country beyond the river is never called ſingly עבר, it ſeems unlikely that עברי ſhould be an adjective for writing, or any thing elſe belonging to that country. The application of it to *Abraham* was for a different reaſon. But as the language was not *Transfluvial*, (for it was *Canaanitiſh)* it is not probable the writing ſhould be termed *Ibri*, as *Transfluvial*, but only as

the alphabet or writing of the *Hebrews*, deſcendants from *Abraham* the *Hebrew*.

——" *AND by the ancient Jews alſo* " *in common and civil affairs, as for in-* " *ſcriptions on their coins, contracts, epi-* " *ſtolary writing, and even to copy the* " *Scriptures* FOR *private uſe.*" *Primævity, ibid.*

AND for ſacred and temple uſes too, if, as ſome Rabbins ſay, the Law was given in *Hibri*, or in *Raaz*, which Mr *Holloway* is no more able to diſprove, than he is able to prove that it was given in *Aſhurit*. Even ſuppoſing it had been firſt given in *Aſhurit*, and was afterwards changed into *Raaz*, yet while the people had but one character, they muſt make uſe of it for all purpoſes of writing, whether for ſacred or common uſes, whether for copying the Scriptures, or writing epiſtles, contracts, &c. We have, indeed, nothing left of either kind, whereby to know what alphabet they uſed, but ſome coins with inſcriptions in their language; and if thoſe which are preſumed to have been ſtruck in the reigns of their Kings be not counterfeit, they will determine the

*Raaz*

*Raaz* to have been the alphabet in uſe in thoſe reigns.

——"*BY which means that which is* "*now called Hebrew, had then the title of* "*Aſhurît.*" Ibid.

So he may imagine, but no ſuch thing appears. It is more than the Rabbins themſelves have ſaid.

——"*AND that which was then* "*termed* Hebrew *in that ſenſe of Tranſ-* "*fluvial (which was indeed the Aramitiſh)* "*was afterwards called the Samaritan, from* "*the people of* Samaria, *(a mixt colony of* "*Chaldeans, Aſſyrians, &c.) who had copied* "*the books of the Law in it.*" *Primævity, ibid.*

What was then termed *Hebrew*, was indeed afterwards called *Samaritan* for the reaſon he gives. But that it was termed *Hebrew* in the ſenſe of a *Tranſfluvial character*, or that it was *indeed the Aramitiſh* alphabet, is another imagination of his own, for which, at leaſt, he has no good ground, or juſt pretence.

——"*AND theſe things thus obtained* "*chiefly till after the* Babyloniſh Captivity." *Ibid.*

NOBODY would ſuſpect, after reading his account with this grave obſervation annexed to it, that the Rabbins, who are his only vouchers, had given a different account of the matter, as it ſtood before the *Babyloniſh* Captivity. He ſhould, I think, have taken *the whole* of their wonderful tradition or *none* of it. Had he but briefly mentioned as much out of *Voiſin* or *Buxtorf*, as was neceſſary to make his reader underſtand what the true doctrine of theſe Rabbins was; his authorities for the *Aſhurît* and *Hibri* diſtinction could not have been miſtaken as they now may. *Buxtorf* has fairly laid down all the evidence that both the Talmuds afford towards proving what Mr *Holloway* aims at. If he will take it altogether, he may make the beſt uſe of it that he pleaſes. But the grounding a diſtinction on their teſtimony, which is not according to the whole of their teſtimony, cannot be allowed to paſs without proper exceptions.

I MIGHT add ſome ſtrange proofs that the *Aſhurit* was the character in which *Moſes* wrote the Law *, and as ſtrange conceits

* As that mentioned by *Lightfoot*, Vol. II. p. 139. viz.

conceits about the original exemplar of it on the tables of ſtone †, and both taken from thoſe Rabbins that ſo ſtrenuouſly aſſert the *Aſhurit* writing: But I ſhall only throw a note into the margin as a ſpecimen of their wildneſſes, and proceed in the examination of Mr *Holloway*'s remarks.

—" *FOR before that* (viz. *before the* " *Babyloniſh Captivity) we find that the ſa-*

viz. *Rabbi Simeon ben Elcaſar* ſaith in the name of *R. Eliezer ben Parta*, and he in the name of *R. Lazar the Hammodean*, that the Law was given in *Aſhurit* writing, becauſe it is ſaid, *Exod.* xxvii. 10. ווי העמודים, *The hooks of the pillars.* Which *Buxtorf* explains thus.——" Pro- " bant literas illas quas hodie habemus eas eſſe quibus Lex " olim data, ex eo quod *Uncini* in linguâ Hebræa a *Moſe* " vocantur ווין *Vavin*. *Vav* a figura ſcilicet literæ *Vau*. " Unde concludunt tempore *Moſis* jam literam *Vau* pictam " fuiſſe inſtar *Uncini*, ſicut hodie." *Theſ.* 14. But others think they meant to intimate the likeneſs of the letter ו to a column with it's chapiter.

† As that mentioned by *Buxtorf* from thoſe Rabbins, that ſaid *Mem & Samech quæ in tabulis erant miraculosè ſtabant*, *Talm. Bab. Tract. Megilah*, cap. 1. Which conceit, as *Buxtorf* tells us, depended on *another*, viz. that all the letters were cut quite through the tables, ſo as to appear diſtinctly on either ſide of them. But *Samech* and *Mem final* in the *Aſhurît* character being of that form, that the ſubſtance of the ſtone which was included within them, would be intirely ſeparated from the body of the ſtone through which they were cut, therefore the parts of the ſtone which they included, could not ſtand without a miracle.

" *cred tongue and character were termed the* " *Jews language and writing.*" *Ibid.*

AND were not therefore, I preſume, in thoſe days termed *Aſhurit* or *Hibri*. But as for their language it is not concerned in this queſtion.

——" *AND in the mean time the gen-* " *tile adjective the Aſſyrian, the alphabet of* " *which is pretended to have been taken by* " Ezra, *inſtead of the old Hebrew, never* " *diſtinguiſhed either character or language* " *at any time or in any place whatſoever.* " *But the* Syrian *tongue went under the more* " *general and comprehenſive denomination of* " *the Aramitiſh.*" Ibid.

ALL this may be very true, and yet in the mean time *Aſhurit* as an appellative might no more diſtinguiſh the *Jewiſh* character in writing at that time, than *the gentile adjective* diſtinguiſhed the *Aramitiſh* character. The *Syrian* tongue is called *Aramith*, 2 Kings xviii. 26. Iſa. xxxvi. 11. yet this proves nothing concerning either the *Jewiſh* or *Syriac* alphabets in thoſe days. In *Eſther* viii. 9. mention is made both of the Jews language and *writing*. Yet no light from hence, whether it was *Aſhurit* or *Hibri*. *R. Salomon* indeed,

indeed, on *Eſther* ix. 27. where it is ſaid that the Jews took upon themſelves to keep the days of *Purim* בכתבם *juxta Scripturam eorum*, interprets this word of the *Aſhurit* writing: And infers from thence, that it was the Jews proper character; if *Buxtorf* rightly repreſents his meaning, and his inference *. ——Yet this interpretation is ſo far fetched, and hath ſo little air of probability, that it will yield no aid to Mr *Holloway*'s hypotheſis.

——"*AND ſo, I ſay, matters continued till after the reſtoration from Babylon.*" Ibid.

So——How? He hath proved nothing yet about theſe matters, but that the Jews had both *language and writing* before the Captivity. He hath referred to the Rabbins for a proof of two alphabets; but none of them make this out. Some of them, indeed, ſpeak of a ſecret alphabet known to *one perſon only in a generation*, in order to be divulged in due time; but they ſuppoſe it *loſt* the mean while, or *forgotten*

* Ut libellus ille quotannis legatur *Scripturâ Aſſyriacâ*. ——Ergo ſtatuit *Scripturam illam* tum fuiſſe Judæorum *propriam* quæ *Aſſyriaca* dicitur. *Eſtheræ* enim Hiſtoria contigit ante tempora *Ezræ*. Theſ. 20.

*forgotten* among the people, who made uſe of a character given in it's ſtead; which they call, indeed, *Raaz*, but by which they appear to mean the *Samaritan*. And others ſay, there was but one alphabet, viz. this *Raaz* or *Samaritan* in which the Law was given. And excepting a conjecture of *R. Salomon*, that the book of *Eſther* was written in *Aſhurit*, we hear nothing of *Aſhurit copies of the Scriptures, continued to be written for ſacred and temple uſes, ever after* the giving of the Law. All theſe ſeem to be mere ſuperſtructures on ſome of the Rabbinnical traditions.

—" *BEFORE which time* (viz. before the reſtoration from *Babylon) the* Samaritans *having alſo copied the Law in that Tranſfluvial Aramitiſh character which had (till that time) been the Jews Hebrew, as I have ſaid, for common uſes:*" *ibid.*

So he had, indeed, *ſaid*, and truly enough, had he dropped thoſe two epithets *Tranſfluvial* and *Aramitiſh*, which he beſtows without reaſon upon the Jews alphabet; and alſo if he had not confined it to *common uſes*, excluſive of *ſacred* ones, for which

which reſtriction he has, I conceive, no authority.

—" *THE Jews wholly laid it aſide, re-*
" *taining the Aſhurit, or bleſſed and ſacred*
" *character for copying the Scriptures, as*
" *well for common, as for ſynagogue or ſa-*
" *cred uſe; and leaving the other transfluvial*
" *Aramitiſh Hebrew alphabet to the* Samari-
" tans *only, and altogether.*" Ibid.

IT will be juſt as eaſy to ſay, and for any thing that he or the Rabbins have ſhewn to the contrary, it is as right to ſay, that the Jews wholly laid aſide the Hebrew alphabet they had always uſed before, and made uſe of the *Chaldee* letter for the future, in copying the Scriptures. Mr *Holloway* judges right, indeed, to reſtrain their uſe of the ſuppoſed *Aſhurit*, or ſacred character, to copying the Scriptures, becauſe it appears from the *Shekels* ſtruck after the Captivity, eſpecially thoſe in the time of *Simon the Juſt*, which are commonly reputed genuine, that they did not uſe the *Chaldee character then* in *all* their *civil* affairs, nor conſequently leave their own alphabet to the *Samaritans wholly* and *altogether*. And if ever there was a time when the Jews made uſe of two characters,

ters, this ſeems to have been the time, when they might uſe their old Hebrew character in inſcriptions on their coins, and in ſome other civil matters, and their new letter, borrowed from the *Chaldees*, as being more beautiful and elegant, for copying their Holy Scriptures. And this might probably give riſe to the diſtinction between *Aſhurite* and *Hibri*, as proper gentile adjectives, the one beginning to be generally uſed after the days of *Ezra*, for copying the Scriptures, and the other as yet retained for many civil uſes. Out of which diſtinction the fruitful fancies of the Rabbins, ſome ages after, raiſed all thoſe wonders out of *Aſhurit*, which I have mentioned above, and ſettled upon it *that* prerogative of *ſacredneſs* in it's original and uſe, which hath taken ſuch ſtrong hold on Mr *Holloway*'s apprehenſion.

——" *SINCE which, ſome of theſe* " *words have croſſed ſignifications again*; " *the Jews uſing their ſaid Aſhurit Hebrew* " *character to denominate, not only the ſa-* " *cred language and character, but alſo that* " Syriac *which was vernacular to them after* " *their ſaid return from* Babylon." p. 97.

SIGNI-

SIGNIFICATIONS, indeed, are very remarkably croſſed when the character of a language is uſed to denominate, not only the language itſelf, but another language too. Yet perhaps there was no croſſing in the caſe. For according to the common opinion of this matter, all lies eaſy and expedite. If the Jews took the *Aſſyrian* language for their vernacular tongue, as well as the *Aſſyrian* character to copy their Hebrew Scriptures with, it could not be improper to denominate both the *one* and the *other* by *Aſhurît*, as a gentile proper adjective. Whereas it is not a little ſtrange how they ſhould come, according to Mr *Holloway*'s account, to denominate *Syriac* by that ſame word which they had till then, according to him, appropriated to their own ſacred alphabet, in contradiſtinction to the *Aramitiſh*. But what reaſon has he to ſuppoſe the term *Aſhurit* to have been thus applied by them?

——" *AS we ſee* (ſays he) *in the New* " *Teſtament ſeveral perſons and places are* " *expreſſed to be named by their names in the* " *Hebrew tongue as* Golgotha, Betheſda, " &c. *Which yet are not Hebrew words, but* " *of that* Syriac *dialect as aforeſaid.*" *ibid.*

WHAT

WHAT the drift of this obſervation is, or what effect it can have in the preſent queſtion, I am at a loſs to diſcover. It is grounded, I preſume, on the Greek word Εβραϊστι; which if it could have been underſtood of *characters*, or manner of writing, and the Rabbinical diſtinction abovementioned had then ſubſiſted, might have been pleaded as expreſſive of *Hibri* rather than *Aſhurit*. But now the ſignifications of the words being, on ſuppoſition, croſſed, it ſtands, I ſuppoſe, in Mr *Holloway*'s judgment, for *Aſhurît*. Be that as it will, Εβραϊστι means nothing more than the common language of the Εβραιοι at *Jeruſalem*. It neither means pure *Hebrew* nor pure *Syriac*, (much leſs hath it relation to the alphabet of either) but the mixed dialect ſpoke in *Judæa* in our Lord's time. And how it can be conſidered in any light to ſerve Mr *Holloway*'s preſent purpoſe, muſt be ſhewn by himſelf.

SECT.

## SECT. V.

### *CONCLUSION.*

AND now I muſt leave the reader to judge how far he hath *explicated out of the writings of the ancient Rabbins, the whole ſtory of the pretended change of the ancient Hebrew letter or character by* Ezra: Or how far the Rabbins *accounts of it are in ſubſtance, as he hath collected.*

I SHALL only further obſerve, that the pretence itſelf of this account being derived from the *ancient Rabbins*, (if by that is meant the *moſt ancient* of thoſe whoſe ſentiments can be gathered) is not well founded. The *Veteres Rabbini*, with whom *Origen* and *Jerom* converſed, gave a different account of the matter from that which Mr *Holloway* eſpouſes, as is gathered from the teſtimonies of thoſe Fathers.

THE

THE Rabbins of the later ages were the men from whom the *whole ſtory* of the modern Hebrew letters, being the ſame that *Moſes* uſed, hath *gone abroad*. See *Montfaucon*'s *Palæogr. Græc.* lib. ii. c. 1. and other writers on this queſtion.

PERHAPS the pains that have been taken upon it on either ſide, had been better beſtowed in conſidering the ſubject in another point of view: And it may be worth the attention of thoſe who have both curioſity and leiſure to purſue the enquiry cloſely——Whether it is not very probable that the ſeveral alphabets of the Eaſtern languages, if not of all languages, (for the *Chineſe* have not properly an alphabet) were originally derived from *one* primitive alphabet, and alſo from *that one* in which *Moſes* wrote; if it be true, as there is reaſon to believe it may, that he was the firſt who uſed letters *, taking their

* I ſay, *who uſed* LETTERS, &c. to diſtinguiſh the alphabetical from all other ſpecies of *writing*, which might have been uſed before *Moſes*'s time. Becauſe it is probable that ſome method had been very anciently taken of recording numbers, names, and ſome few general circumſtances, not only from *Exod.* xvii. 14. where *Moſes* is commanded to write *a memorial* in a book, as it ſhould ſeem

their form from the Divine Original, on the tables at Mount *Sinai:* And that all the ſaid alphabets, both the primitive, and afterwards the derived, were in a ſtate of continual change, through ſuch ſmall, but perceptible variations, as time and uſage are wont to produce in all hand-writings, till copying with careful penmanſhip, and the preſervation of the beſt copies, as exemplars of good writing, contributed in ſome meaſure to fix the marks and characters of each alphabet; and till at length the art of printing added more ſtability to them, and aſcertained the forms of letters in the ſeveral alphabets as we now have them.

ſeem before the giving of the Law; but from the old name of a city in *Canaan*, viz. *Kiriath Sepher*, Urbs Librorum, vel Numerationum. The *Chaldee* renders the name of this city by קרית ארכי, whence *Bochart* calls it Civitas *Archivorum*. Others have tranſlated it Urbs *Bibliothecarum*. And from hence ſome learned men have conjectured, that the ancient records of theſe nations were kept in it, whatever might be the method they took in thoſe times of preſerving the memorials of perſons and things. Still the Ten Commandments might be, and probably were *the firſt writing by letters*. And it is pleaſing to imagine ſuch a benefit to mankind, given by God along with his Law. The belief of which is reaſonable, though *Moſes* neither ſaith, nor intimates it.

IT is well known by thoſe who deal much in manuſcripts, that their ages are commonly gueſſed at, nay, and frequently determined by ſomething in the formation of the letters, peculiar to this, or that age, as well as by other marks and ſignatures of their antiquity; and even ſometimes, when there are no other evidences, the age of a manuſcript ſhall be aſcertained *by the hand-writing only*.

WHOEVER looks into *Mabillon de Re Diplomatica*, or *Montfaucon's Palæogr. Græca*, or *Caſley's* Catalogue of Manuſcripts in the King's Library, will find the characters of the ſame language in different and diſtant ages, to vary from themſelves in a manner that is ſurpriſing: And thoſe in the oldeſt manuſcripts, whether Greek or Latin, appear ſo different from what they appear in later copies, and eſpecially from what they are repreſented by the types in printing, that they can ſcarce be known by their form to be characters of the ſame alphabet, or to ſtand for the ſame letters of the ſame language. And yet the oldeſt manuſcripts extant do not expreſs ſome forms of letters anciently uſed in the

ſame

ſame language, that are found engraved on marbles, or ſtamped on metals.

I THINK, likewiſe, it is generally agreed amongſt the learned, that the Greek alphabet was formed from the old *Phenician*, or Hebrew character, the affinity between them appearing not only in the names given to the letters, but in the forms of the letters themſelves, viz. of the ſixteen moſt ancient of the Greek letters, which are found with ſome ſmall variation to be the ſame in *figure* and power with the old letters uſed in *Paleſtine* *. (Vide *Palæogr. Græc.* Lib. ii. cap. 2, 3.)

AND *Pliny*, *Tacitus*, and *Priſcian*, had all of them † obſerved, that the Latin letters, were nearly the *old Greek* letters, and better preſerved in form by the Latins, than by the Greeks themſelves.

THE *Syriac* letters are alſo reputed to have been taken originally from the *Phe-*

 *nician*

* *Spanheim.* de præſt. num. Vol. I. fol. Diſſ. ii. p. 93.

† *Pliny*, Lib. vii. c. 58. De Antiquis Literis.——Veteres Græcas fuiſſe eaſdem pænè quæ ſunt nunc Latinæ.

*Tacitus*, Lib. xi. Formæ literis Latinis, quæ veterrimis Græcorum.

*Priſcian*, Lib. i.

*nician* or *Canaanitiſh* alphabet; and the oldeſt *Syriac* alphabet, called the *Eſtrangelo*, doth very well correſpond with this opinion, the footſteps of the old *Penician* character being very viſible in it. And the other more modern *Syriac* character, called the *Eſhito*, which is both more beautiful in form, and expeditious in uſe, is plainly an improvement upon the *Eſtrangelo*. Why might not the like be ſuppoſed of the two characters uſed at different times by the Jews; and the preſent letter, commonly ſaid to be the *Chaldee*, (Mr *Holloway*'s *Aſhurit*) be an improvement upon the old *Hibri*, or *Samaritan*?

I SAY, it is very ſuppoſable at leaſt, that neither that character now called the *Hebrew*, nor that called the *Samaritan*, is the true original character in which the Law was firſt written; but are characters, which, like others, have gradually changed according to the genius, induſtry, elegance, and taſte, of the perſons who uſed them, and improved them in different ages. It is pretty plain from the money ſtamped in the times of the *Maccabees*, if they be, as is commonly believed, genuine,

ruine, that the character then in uſe was not entirely the ſame either with the preſent *Hebrew*, or *Samaritan*; though agreeing more with the latter. The great alteration therefore from one of theſe alphabets to another, may not have been made all at once after the *Babyloniſh* Captivity; or by *Ezra*'s command, of which there is no poſitive evidence; but by degrees, and ſlow ſteps. For though the letters uſed by *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, might, (like the language itſelf) receive little alteration in the times of the Judges, and of the Kings, (as may appear from hence, that when the Archetype, as ſuppoſed, written by *Moſes*, was found by *Hilkiah* in *Joſiah*'s reign, it was read, as it ſeems, without difficulty) yet after the Captivity, when the Jews had changed their government, their Princes, and in ſome meaſure their language too, it is no wonder, if at the ſame time, they began, in a more remarkable manner to change their manner of writing alſo; firſt, into thoſe characters which appear on the coins of *Simon the Juſt*, and the *Maccabees*, of which characters there is great variety found in

*Montfaucon's*

*Montfaucon*'s and other printed tables *. And then into a character ſoftened, and improved by the *Syriac* or *Chaldee* methods of writing, whoſe peculiar duct of letters would be as naturally introduced, at leaſt in part, in the Jewiſh modes of writing, as the *Chaldee* tongue was introduced into their common language; 'till at length from the greater elegance and beauty of it, with it's greater commodiouſneſs in writing, it was generally made uſe of in copying their Scriptures; while the *Samaritans*, writing leſs than the Jews did, or for other reaſons, might change their character leſs: For they who write moſt, will have the moſt reaſon to bring their letters into an eaſy and ſimple form.

THE ſum of what is intended to be ſuggeſted here, is, that no judgment can be made of the letters of the Ancients, otherwiſe than by having recourſe to the very earlieſt evidences of them that remain to us:——That there is not a greater difference between the preſent *Hebrew* and preſent

* The *Samaritan* character in *Poſtell*'s alphabet of twelve tongues, is different from that given in *Bancuccius*'s grammar, *R. Azarias*, *Villalpand*, *Kircher*, *Scaliger*, *Morin*, and *Hottinger*.

preſent *Samaritan* characters, as now fixed in great meaſure by printing; than there is between the preſent Greek types, and the forms of letters to be found in the oldeſt manuſcripts, and other monuments of Greek antiquity.—That this is according to the example of all other known alphabets, which have been altered in a ſucceſſion of ages from their firſt form, ſo as ſcarcely to ſeem the letters of the ſame language, or to have been derived from the ſame ſource.——That therefore, there is a probability, ariſing from experience in ſimilar caſes, that the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* may have originally been the ſame alphabet,——and *that ſame alphabet* in the form in which it was firſt in uſe, whether revealed by God, or invented by men, may have been, the true mother of all, or moſt of the alphabets that have come to our knowledge.

*The E N D.*